

division, the Warrior division, and the Warrior River Terminal Co. The managers, who are charged with maintenance and repair of terminals, have full authority within the limits prescribed by the by-laws, their activities being coordinated through the executive department. The budget for hull and machinery repairs for line and harbor vessels is prepared annually by the executive department, and as long as this budget is not exceeded and the by-laws are not violated the managers can make repairs without reference to any further authority. In erecting the functional organization to operate our facilities we followed the best lines of railroad practice. We consulted freely with outside experts and paid them well for their services. We continue to do so.

All line vessels are equipped with wireless, and we have four land stations. Each tow or express boat reports to a central station every two hours, giving its position and any difficulties encountered. These reports are charted, and any necessary information regarding channel conditions or other matters of importance is constantly available.

Our bills of lading are similar to railroad bills of lading. We offer insurance against all hazards. Each shipper, wherever he may be located—on the river or in the interior—gets precisely the same saving in cents per hundred pounds when he ships by our lines. In the making of joint rates the normal 20 per cent river saving is applied to a combined rail-river haul. For example, if the river saving from St. Louis to New Orleans by water were \$1 per ton, this saving would be subtracted from the all-rail ton rate from Chicago to New Orleans, and the joint rail-water rate, Chicago-St. Louis-New Orleans, would be \$1 less per ton than the all-rail rate from Chicago to New Orleans.

What have been the results of this Government enterprise? The history of the Warrior River Terminal Co., a subsidiary of the Inland Waterways Corporation, offers one striking example of the efficiency with which the corporation operates.

The Warrior River Terminal Co. was originally the Ensley Southern Railroad, and was owned by the Southern Railway. The Southern Railway claimed that the Ensley Southern was a nonpaying line, threw it into the hands of a receiver, and finally asked for its abandonment. This action was not approved by the court, which ordered the road sold for \$500,000. It was bought in 1926 by the Warrior River Terminal Co., the entire stock of which is owned by the Inland Waterways Corporation. We have rehabilitated the road and provided equipment at an additional cost of about \$383,000 up to November 30, 1929. The total corporation investment in the Warrior River Terminal amounted to \$775,018.26 in 1928. On April 18, 1929, the Interstate Commerce Commission wrote us a letter, of which the essential paragraph follows:

"In your letter of April 12, transmitting the return of the Warrior River Terminal Co. to the commission's order of January 18, 1929, you state that although the return shows net operating income of \$30,885.98 in excess of 6 per cent on the value of the property of this company, no remittance of such excess has been made."

Thus the corporation took over a railroad 19 miles in length which had been thrown into the hands of a receiver and ordered sold by a court in 1926, and rehabilitated the property so that in 1928 it earned more than \$30,000 in excess of 6 per cent on the value of the property.

When the Inland Waterways Corporation was organized a survey was made by the American Appraisal Co. to adjust and appraise the value of the assets of the Inland and Coastwise Waterways Service transferred to the corporation. The sound value, with nothing allowed for good will, thus entered upon the books of the corporation amounted to \$9,762,858. In November, 1929, the book value of the corporation was no less than \$19,746,350.06. The capital stock of the corporation, originally fixed at \$5,000,000, was later increased to \$15,000,000. On December 31, 1929, there was a little more than \$2,200,000 of cash on hand and unissued stock to the amount of \$6,000,000.

A study of the accounts of this corporation, its methods of operation, and its financial results will, I believe, demonstrate that its operations have been highly efficient. In my opinion, any similarly organized Government corporation can be made just as efficient.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I will ask the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. GLENN] whether he desires to proceed this evening?

Mr. GLENN. I would rather not. I would prefer to go on to-morrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oregon what the expectation is respecting to-morrow's program?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move now a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow, at which time an effort will be made to reach some understanding with regard to the time to be consumed in debating the veterans' bill and respecting a time to vote on the bill, to be followed immediately by a further consideration of the river and harbor bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 3341) providing for the acquire-

ment of additional lands for the naval air station at Seattle, Wash.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7822) amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 964, ch. 301), entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation"; and for other purposes.

PAYMENTS TO EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8958, for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad. This bill has passed the House, and it has been reported favorably by the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MOSES. It is the Alaska Railroad bill?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is. It is merely to permit the Secretary of the Interior to make certain payments which have been declared to be illegal by the Comptroller General.

Mr. MOSES. I hope the bill may be passed.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the Alaska Railroad fund the following several sums of money to the respective claimants herein named, their heirs, or legal representatives: J. J. C. Moore, \$1,025.18; C. Balheiser, \$955.52; J. L. Axe, \$780.14; W. F. Clark, \$359.19; John W. Galloway, \$176.33; C. A. Matheson, \$641.27; Milton Boyer, \$417.40; A. A. Lewis, \$3.36; J. D. Urban, \$2.80; R. C. Lockhead, \$8.04; A. C. Nicodet, \$4.02; P. H. Crowley, \$8.04; A. Baumberger, \$6.60; J. S. Rodebaugh, \$7.68; P. D. Waugh, \$6.40; J. C. Hutton, \$6.40; R. B. Lewis, \$7.02; in all, \$4,415.39.

SEC. 2. Payment of the several sums of money, as herein provided, to the claimants named, or, in case of death, their heirs or legal representatives, shall be in full satisfaction of their respective claims as indicated in the Department of the Interior.

LAKE SABINE BRIDGE, TEXAS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 11966, to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Sabine at or near Port Arthur, Tex.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Lake Sabine, between a point at or near Port Arthur, Tex., and a point opposite in Cameron Parish, La., authorized to be built by H. L. McKee, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, by the act of Congress approved May 18, 1928, heretofore extended by the act of Congress approved March 2, 1929, are hereby further extended one and three years, respectively, from May 18, 1930.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, June 19, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, June 18, 1930

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our loving Heavenly Father, we praise Thee for all the sweet and beautiful memories that cluster about Thy providences, these all witness to divine care. Evermore may we look unto Thee with sincere and thankful hearts. We do desire to rest in the sublime trust that Thou who hast made and guided us will order all things aright. Hasten the day when nations and peoples shall not live by envy, by jealousy, by rivalry, or any form of selfishness. Everywhere may the power of God be discerned in culture, in understanding, and in mutual fidelities. Bless us with the heart of love that restrains fear and encourages at all times the very best that is in us. In the name of our blessed Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 669. An act for the relief of Seth J. Harris; and
- H. R. 8127. An act for the relief of J. W. Nelson.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

- H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. Frank Shetter;
- H. R. 887. An act for the relief of Mary R. Long;
- H. R. 936. An act for the relief of Glen D. Tolman;
- H. R. 3430. An act for the relief of Anthony Marcum; and
- H. R. 7997. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of additional land for the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

- S. 2625. An act for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane;
- S. 2801. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate all phases of taxation in relation to agriculture;
- S. 3064. An act to make permanent the additional office of district judge created for the eastern district of Illinois by the act of September 14, 1922;
- S. 3206. An act for the relief of Rebecca Green;
- S. 3472. An act for the relief of H. F. Frick and others;
- S. 3615. An act to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913;
- S. 4123. An act to provide for the aiding of farmers in any State by the making of loans to drainage districts, levee districts, levee and drainage districts, counties, boards of supervisors, and/or other political subdivisions and legal entities, and for other purposes;
- S. 4400. An act to legalize a pier constructed in Chesapeake Bay at Annapolis Roads, Md., and to legalize an intake pipe in Warren Cove, at Plymouth, Mass.;
- S. 4517. An act to provide for the regulation of tolls over certain bridges;
- S. 4554. An act to amend the red light law of the District of Columbia;
- S. 4584. An act for the relief of Ellwood G. Babbitt and other officers and employees of the Foreign Commerce Service of the Department of Commerce who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of Government funds or personal property by reason of theft, catastrophe, shipwreck, or other causes, and for the relief of U. R. Webb, commander, Medical Corps, United States Navy;
- S. 4598. An act for the relief of Lowela Hanlin;
- S. 4722. An act creating the Great Lakes Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Clair River, at or near Port Huron, Mich.;
- S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution creating a commission to make a study with respect to the adequacy of the supply of unskilled agricultural labor; and
- S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to provide for the erection of a monument to William Howard Taft at Manila, P. I.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4189) entitled "An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CUTTING, Mr. KENDRICK, and Mr. WALSH of Montana to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7822) entitled "An act amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stats. 964; ch. 301), entitled 'An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation,' and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2414) entitled "An act authorizing the Government of the United States to participate in the international hygiene exhibition at Dresden, Germany, from May 6, 1930, to October 1, 1930, inclusive."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 9110) entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the

House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOSES, Mr. REED, and Mr. HARRISON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3258) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10813) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes."

STATUS OF AFFAIRS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the status of the Five Civilized Tribes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, so many inquiries are made of me with reference to the present status of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes: Cherokees, Creeks, Seminoles, Choctaws, and Chickasaws, that I have thought it helpful to give the members of these tribes and others interested the advantage of the data which I have collected, showing their present status.

The commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, commonly known as the Dawes Commission, was sent to them under an act of March 3, 1893, to negotiate agreements with each with the view of making their final rolls, allotting their lands, distributing their money, and finally having the area which they occupied admitted as a State in the Union.

AGREEMENTS AND LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR ALLOTMENT AND MAKING FINAL ROLLS

Agreements were made with the Choctaws and Chickasaws on the 23d day of April, 1897, and with the Creeks on the 27th day of September, 1897, and these agreements were approved by Congress by the act of June 28, 1898. An agreement was entered into with the Seminoles on the 16th day of December, 1897, and it was ratified and confirmed by Congress on July 1, 1898. An act of Congress was submitted on July 1, 1902, to the Cherokees for ratification, which they accepted and approved by a popular vote on August 7, 1902, which was afterwards commonly known as the Cherokee agreement.

All of these agreements provided for making the rolls of the respective tribes, the allotment of their lands, and the disbursement of their money among the members found entitled to enrollment.

These agreements, as amended by subsequent acts of Congress and finally by the act of April 26, 1906, provided for extending the time and for making the rolls as of date March 4, 1906, and directed that this work be finally completed on or before March 4, 1907.

Pursuant to this legislation the commission enrolled 41,798 on the Cherokee rolls, 20,799 on the Choctaw rolls, 6,304 on the Chickasaw rolls, 3,127 on the Seminole rolls, and 18,774 on the Creek rolls.

The agreements and legislation under which the several rolls were made contained restrictions against the alienation, lease, or incumbrance of all their lands allotted for different periods of time. The act of April 26, 1906, extended the restrictive period for 25 years as to the full-blood members of the Five Civilized Tribes. Congress, by the act of May 27, 1908, removed in whole all restrictions upon the lands allotted to the members enrolled as of less than one-half Indian blood and from the surplus allotments of members enrolled as of one-half Indian blood.

The act of May 10, 1928, extended the restrictive period on certain lands of members of the Five Civilized Tribes and exempted a part of them, not to exceed 160 acres, from taxation, for a period of 25 years on and after April 26, 1931.

The restrictions were extended on a part of the lands of approximately 10,000 of the 101,519 originally enrolled members of the Five Civilized Tribes. The exact enumeration is now being made.

APPROPRIATIONS IN AID OF COMMON SCHOOLS

In lieu of the taxes not collected from the tax-exempt lands held by the allotted members of the Five Civilized Tribes or their restricted heirs Congress makes annual appropriations in aid of the common schools in eastern Oklahoma. In 1928 the amount appropriated by Congress was \$150,000. This was in-

creased in 1929 to \$250,000, and the present appropriation bill carries \$350,000 in aid of common schools in eastern Oklahoma.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR BOARDING SCHOOLS

In addition, a number of Indian boarding schools attended by children of the Five Civilized Tribes are maintained from the Federal Treasury. The present Interior Department appropriation bill carries for the Chilocco Indian Boarding School, \$383,000; for the Sequoyah Orphan Training School, \$165,625; for the Eufaula Boarding School, \$45,950; for the Eufaula Boarding School, \$58,250; for the Carter Seminary (Bloomfield Academy), \$78,800; for the Haskell Institute at Lawrence, Kans., \$375,500; 40 per cent of the attendance is by children of the Five Civilized Tribes, \$150,200; and the sum of \$58,000 is expended on the Seneca Indian school at Wyandotte, Kans., and \$39,000 on the Pawnee Indian school from the lump sum appropriated for Indian boarding schools.

Expenditures are made from the tribal funds of the Choctaw and Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes for the maintenance of boarding schools and contract schools, amounting to \$233,200.

Twelve thousand eight hundred dollars is authorized to be expended for educational purposes from the Osage tribal funds.

Including the amount expended in aid of common schools and the amounts appropriated for boarding schools, either from the Federal Treasury or authorized to be expended from tribal funds, the aggregate amount is \$1,574,825, which is intended in part to relieve the State and local communities of this amount of their financial burden.

CONSERVATION OF HEALTH

For conservation of health among the Indians there is maintained from the Federal Treasury hospitals at Tahihina, \$50,000; Claremore, \$30,000; Shawnee, \$178,000; Seger, \$7,000; Pawnee and Ponca, \$26,000; and for the Cheyenne and Arapahoe hospital, maintenance \$33,000, and construction \$12,000; at an aggregate expense of \$399,000.

In addition to these appropriations for education and health the Government expends approximately \$252,000 in support of the office of Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes and the probate attorneys, and \$264,000 from the Osage funds in support of the Osage Agency.

The total amount expended for schools, health, and administrative purposes, not including those for the Indian tribes in the western part of Oklahoma, aggregates \$2,489,825.

BALANCES TO THE CREDIT OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

On May 17, 1930, the department reported the available balances of tribal funds of the Five Civilized Tribes as follows:

Choctaw Nation.....	\$173,903.17
Chickasaw Nation (overdrawn).....	8,702.17
Creek Nation.....	3,766.98
Seminole Nation.....	173,503.53

The affairs of all of the Five Civilized Tribes have practically been wound up. The Cherokee Tribe does not have an acre of land nor a dollar of money to its credit. The Creeks have the Eufaula school property at Sapulpa and the school property at Eufaula, both maintained from the Federal Treasury. The Seminole Tribe has the Mekuskey school property and the above balance of \$173,503.53, less any expenditures subsequently made, and the Choctaws and Chickasaws have their school property known as the Jones Academy, Wheelock Academy, and the Carter Seminary, formerly Bloomfield Academy, near Ardmore, and their coal and asphalt deposits, and legislation has been enacted at the present session of Congress to reappraise and reoffer for sale these deposits; also a few town lots and a few remaining unsold tracts of land, in addition to the amounts above stated, less any expenditures made subsequent to May 17, 1930, and to which should be added perhaps some revenues from coal taken from leased mines.

THE LEASED DISTRICT CLAIM

Legislation is pending in Congress to refer the claim for the lands embraced in the "leased district" to the Court of Claims for a report of its findings to Congress whether the United States should pay to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations additional compensation and, if any, the amount for said lands.

JURISDICTIONAL BILLS AUTHORIZING THE BRINGING OF SUITS ON BEHALF OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES

Congress, by the act of March 19, 1924, authorized the Cherokee Nation, or Tribe, to bring suit against the Government of the United States in the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court, for any or all claims which the tribe had against the Government. Similar authority was granted to the Seminoles by act approved May 20, 1924; the Creeks by act approved May 24, 1924; and the Choctaws and Chickasaws by act approved June 7, 1924.

At the request of the attorneys employed to represent the respective tribes who feared that the filing of one suit upon any one claim would exhaust the jurisdiction of the court under the several bills, I prepared and assisted in passing a bill authorizing each of the tribes to bring as many separate suits as the attorneys deemed advisable under the several original jurisdictional acts. The accountants for some of the tribes not having completed their work, at the request of the attorneys representing these tribes I prepared and Congress passed the act of February 19, 1929, extending the time for each of the tribes within which suits might be filed under the several original jurisdictional acts as subsequently amended, until June 30, 1930. After this date no further suit may be filed.

Under the authority granted by the several original jurisdictional acts the members of the respective tribes, acting through their accredited representatives, employed attorneys with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and have filed a number of suits covering claims by their respective tribes against the Government.

The attorneys especially employed to represent the respective tribes have reported the following suits filed for claims against the Government. The Court of Claims and the Supreme Court will have to pass upon the allegations and contentions of the attorneys in each of these suits and I am, therefore, giving a list of the various suits filed indicating what the claims are for and the amounts involved without expressing an opinion as to their merits for the reason that the court after all of the testimony, oral and documentary, is filed in each case, both for the tribe and the Government, and oral arguments made and briefs submitted, will finally pass upon them.

The following lists show the number and brief basis of each suit filed on behalf of each tribe as prepared and reported by the attorneys of the respective tribes:

CHEROKEE NATION

The attorneys representing the Cherokee Nation have filed suits, as follows:

1. Clifton Roll case—Cherokee Nation v. United States Court of Claims, No. H-47. Filed February 9, 1927. This claim is for \$436,803.36 with interest at 5 per cent and is for money paid by the Government to Freedmen in the nineties (last century) who never were Cherokee Freedmen but State Freedmen. This petition has nothing to do with the main Freedmen petition.

2. Too Late Baby case—Cherokee Nation v. United States Court of Claims, No. J-8. Filed March 12, 1928. Claim is for \$8,915,160.20 with interest at 5 per cent for money alleged to have been unlawfully paid to persons not living September 1, 1902, and therefore not entitled to participate in the distribution. This suit is to test the constitutionality of the act of April 26, 1906, extending the date as of which the roll was to be made from September 1, 1902, to March 4, 1906.

3. Freedmen case, Cherokee Nation v. United States, Court of Claims, No. K-17. Filed January 17, 1929. Claim is for \$10,638,559, for unlawful allotments of land made and money paid to Freedmen.

4. Trust fund—Cherokee Nation v. United States, Court of Claims, No. L-46. Filed February 18, 1930. Claim is for \$669,793.05, which includes interest at 5 per cent to June 30, 1926, for money alleged to have been unlawfully paid out of trust funds of the Cherokees.

5. Suit No. L-174, filed May 9, 1930: (1) For the Eastern Cherokees, and (2) for the Western Cherokees. The petition in this suit contains two counts:

A. For and on behalf of the Eastern Cherokees involving a restatement of interest amounting to \$2,653,596.12, and

B. For the benefit of the Western Cherokees involving a restatement of interest amounting to \$362,687.01.

6. Suit No. L-257, filed June 26, 1930, for shortage of land. This claim is for a shortage of land and is for a balance of 575,082.23 acres of land described in the Cherokee Patent of 1838, which has not been accounted for.

7. Suit No. L-266, filed June 28, 1930. This claim is for land embraced in the "outlet" and "promised" as stated in the first article of the treaty of 1846, amounting to at least the acreage contained in the panhandle of Oklahoma west of 100 degrees, or approximately 3,000,000 acres, which at \$1.25 would amount to \$3,750,000.

8. Suit No. L-267, filed June 28, 1930. This suit has two counts:

(1) Claim for money paid to intermarried whites, with interest from date of payment at 5 per cent per annum, \$69,000.

(2) Claim for money paid for intruder improvements, \$250,000.

9. Suit No. L-268, filed June 28, 1930, general accounting petition. This suit involves a general accounting, challenging many items erroneously expended from tribal funds without

authority of law or treaty not extending beyond a period beginning in 1902. Twenty-eight specific claims.

CREEK NATION

There have been filed on behalf of the Creek Nation petitions in the following suits:

1. F-168 (filed May 20, 1926). This is known in the office as the Fort Jackson case. This suit is brought for lands taken under the treaty of 1814. This treaty makes no provision for payment of lands. On January 10, 1927, a demurrer to the petition was sustained by the Court of Claims on the ground that the claim did not come within the jurisdictional bill and an application was made for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the same was denied. A bill is now pending before Congress to have the Court of Claims make a report to Congress as to the amount which in fairness and justice the United States should pay for these lands.

2. F-205 (filed July 3, 1926). This is known in the office as the Creek-Oklahoma Boundary case. This suit was brought for a strip of land along the western boundary of the present lands of the Creek Nation, which was opened to homesteaders through an erroneous survey. This case has been ready for trial since December, 1927.

3. F-369 (filed November 29, 1926). The petition in this case is identical with that in the Seminole case, No. L-88. It involves the questions of the right of the railroads to take what are known as station reservations, now used for nonrailroad purposes; the failure of the United States to collect the \$15 per mile per annum charge for railroads, and several other related matters.

4. F-371 (filed December 2, 1926). This case involves questions arising under the treaty of 1866.

5. F-375 (filed December 2, 1926). This is known in the office as the Erroneous Enrollment case. This case involves erroneous enrollment of persons as citizens of the Creek Nation, duplicated and triplicated enrollments of citizens, and so forth; the recovery of the value of lands allotted to them, and equalization money paid them.

6. H-510 (filed November 28, 1927). This suit is brought on various items aggregating \$569,846.07, spent by the Secretary of the Interior, out of the trust funds of the Creeks alleged to be without authority of Congress. Same as Seminole L-51.

7. L-78 (filed March 13, 1930). This case is the same as the case filed for the Seminole Nation No. L-123. It presents a claim for the funds of Creek Nation expended for education, construction of buildings, and equipment of persons not children of citizens of the Creek Nation, or citizens thereof. An accounting is requested, and judgment for the amounts so expended is asked.

8. No. L-136 (filed April 26, 1930). This petition presents claims arising from the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to comply with section 15 of the act of April 26, 1906, and sell buildings, property, and so forth, of the tribe.

9. No. L-137 (filed April 26, 1930). This petition presents what is known as the town-lot frauds, and prays for an accounting in regard to them.

10. No. L-168 (filed May 6, 1930). Known in the office as the Alabama reservation case. This case is a claim for the value of 2,187,200 acres of land which should have been sold for the benefit of the Creeks in 1837.

11. No. L-205 (filed May 31, 1930). This claim is for the value of 2,397.71 acres of land, excluded from the Creek Nation by an erroneous survey under the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 265).

12. No. L-206 (filed May 31, 1930). This claim is for the recovery of \$270,283.71, part of the proceeds of the sales of lands under the act of March 1, 1889 (25 Stat. 757), which was illegally paid by the Creek treasurer as attorney's fees, and which the United States as trustee of said nation failed or refused to recover for their benefit.

13. No. L-234 (filed June 16, 1930). A claim of \$150,000,000 for the value of the mineral rights to the beds of rivers running through the Creek Nation, which were reserved to the said nation by the Creek agreement and which were lost to the Creek Nation by the failure of the United States to protect it in the possession of same.

14. No. L-263 (filed June 28, 1930). A general claim for any amounts due the Creek Nation under its trust relations with the United States.

SEMINOLE NATION

Suits have been filed on behalf of the Seminole Nation in the following cases:

1. No. L-51, filed February 24, 1930. This petition presents a claim for the expenditure of the trust funds of the Seminole Nation for purposes other than those authorized by Congress. An accounting is asked to determine the amounts so expended without authority of law, and judgment for same is requested.

2. No. L-87, filed March 21, 1930. This petition presents two distinct claims, which are set forth as follows:

A. That the \$500,000 permanent school fund created under the Seminole agreement of December 16, 1897 (30 Stat. 567), has been mismanaged and misspent by the United States for purposes other than those specified in said agreement. An accounting is asked to determine the amounts so expended without authority of law, and judgment for same is requested.

B. That under the act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137), the Secretary of the Interior was directed to sell all tribal buildings and other property of the Seminole Nation and to place the proceeds of said sale to the credit of the Seminole Nation. That although the said property was taken over by the United States and converted to its own use, yet same has not been sold as directed. An accounting is asked to determine whether or not the said nation has been paid for said property, and if not, judgment for the value of same and for the use and occupation of same is requested.

3. No. L-88, filed March 21, 1930. This petition presents claims arising out of grants of lands to railroad companies of rights of way through the country of the Seminole Nation. Said claims are set forth as follows:

A. Misuse of said rights of way for purposes other than those necessary for the operation of said railroads.

B. Misappropriation of lands for station reservations for purposes other than those necessary for the operation of said railroads.

C. Nonpayment to said Seminole Nation for lands so taken.

D. Nonpayment of the \$15 per mile per annum charge.

It is alleged that the United States, as trustee, has failed to collect from said railroad companies for the lands so unlawfully taken from the Seminole Nation, and has failed to collect the annual charge. An accounting is asked to determine whether or not the Seminole Nation has been paid for any of said lands, and judgment is requested for the amounts so found to be due said nation.

4. No. L-89, filed March 21, 1930. This petition presents a claim for allotments of lands and the distribution of funds of the Seminole Nation to persons of African descent, alleged to be in violation of treaties, and of the rights of the Seminole Nation. An accounting is asked, and judgment is requested, for amounts found to be so due.

5. No. L-123, filed April 11, 1930. This petition presents a claim for the funds of Seminole Nation expended for education, construction of buildings, and equipment of persons not children of citizens of the Seminole Nation, or citizens thereof. An accounting is requested, and judgment for the amounts so expended is asked.

6. No. L-207, filed May 31, 1930. This petition presents a claim for the illegal sale of Seminole town lots, and prays an accounting for same.

No. L-208, filed May 31, 1930. This petition presents two distinct claims:

(a) This claim is for the value of 11,550.54 acres of land excluded from the Seminole national domain by an erroneous survey of land guaranteed to them under the treaty of March 21, 1866 (14 Stat. 755).

(b) A claim for \$250,000 invested by the Seminole Nation in the Wewoka Mission School property which they lost by building same on lands of the Creek Nation in reliance on an erroneous survey of the United States.

7. No. L-309 (filed May 31, 1930).

This petition presents four distinct claims:

(a) An accounting is requested of all moneys illegally paid out to the Seminole treasurer under the act of April 15, 1874, (18 Stat. 29), and judgment is prayed for same with interest.

(b) A claim for \$20,000 illegally paid out under the act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 402), for debts that were not legal obligations of the Seminole Nation.

(c) A claim for the recovery of \$191,294.20, part of the proceeds of the sales of Seminole lands under the act of March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 1004), which was illegally paid by the Seminole treasurer, as attorney's fees, and which the United States as trustee of said Indians failed or refused to recover for their benefit.

(d) A claim for \$15,000 for a mill to have been furnished under the treaty of March 21, 1866 (14 Stat. 755), which was never furnished in accordance with the terms of said treaty.

8. No. L-233 (filed June 16, 1930).

A claim for the mineral rights reserved to the Seminole Nation by the Seminole agreement and the Curtis Act, which rights were lost to the Seminole Nation by the failure of the United States, to protect it in the possession of same. An accounting is requested for all minerals extracted.

9. No. L-262 (filed June 28, 1930).

A general claim for any amounts due the Seminole Nation under its trust relations with the United States.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW NATIONS

Petitions have been filed in suits on behalf of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the following cases:

1. Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations v. The United States. Filed June 4, 1926. Case No. F-181 in the Court of Claims. This case involves two distinct causes of action as follows, to wit:

A. Claim for reimbursement as to lands allotted to minor freedmen enrolled on the Choctaw freedmen roll as minors subsequent to the passage of the act of Congress of April 26, 1906. The number of persons enrolled as Choctaw freedmen minors were 466, to whom allotments were made in the same manner as allotments were made to the original Choctaw freedmen. This is a joint suit and the nations ask for judgment in the sum of \$242,320.

B. The case also involves lands allotted as preferential filings to Choctaw freedmen, and on this count the nations ask for a judgment in the sum of \$283,188.81. The first cause of action is based upon the theory that negro minors were not minor children of citizens of the Choctaw Tribe of Indians, the act of 1902 having defined the word "citizen" and excluded freedmen, and Congress was without authority to allot lands to minors classed as freedmen on the theory that they were children of members or citizens. On the second count, involving preferential filings, the special attorneys have taken the position that there was no treaty authority for these preferential filings and that Congress was without authority to take the lands from these nations by legislative enactment.

2. Choctaw Nation v. the United States. Case No. F-182 in the Court of Claims. Filed June 4, 1926.

This case involves \$139,156.75 paid to ex-Senator Robert L. Owen as a fee for services rendered in behalf of a particular class of members designated as "Mississippi Choctaws." The funds were paid out of the general account of the Choctaw Nation and the special attorneys take the position that the payment was contrary to law in that the Choctaw Nation was not indebted to ex-Senator Owen, and the debt was actually due from a class of individual persons enrolled as "Mississippi Choctaws."

3. Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations v. The United States. No. H-37 in the Court of Claims. Filed February 2, 1927.

This particular case involves three separate and distinct causes of action, which are enumerated as follows:

A. Claim for funds paid to Mississippi Choctaws as per capita payments. The amount involved is \$1,577,280. The special attorneys take the position that there is no treaty or authority for payment to persons enrolled as Mississippi Choctaws of per capita payments; that Mississippi Choctaws were only entitled to the allotment of certain lands under well-defined conditions and that the funds distributed as per capita payments were funds belonging to the native Choctaws arising from the leasing of coal lands from invested funds, from the sale of excess unallotted lands, and other sources.

B. The second cause of action involves the sums alleged to be due the nations for the different railroads operating lines of railway through the nations, and the amount involved is \$125,043.75. These figures are based upon the computation as to mileage as made by the Department of the Interior and the amount alleged to be due includes the sums due from the various railroads having lines through the two nations. The nations take the position that the right of way was only leased to the railroads for so much per mile and that the railroads failed to pay and that the United States Government is responsible for having failed to collect under the terms of the different grants.

C. This count involves the lands allotted to the Choctaw freedmen and the nations sue for \$2,883,620, with interest from the first day of January, 1912. The special attorneys proceed upon the theory that the Choctaw freedmen were never in fact legally adopted as Choctaw citizens and that the nations are entitled to recover for the value of the lands allotted to 5,546 persons placed upon the Choctaw rolls as Choctaw freedmen. We take the position that the Choctaw freedmen were not legally adopted in that the Chickasaw Nation never concurred in the provisions of article 3 of the treaty of 1866, and that the attempted adoption of the freedmen by the Choctaws, without the concurrence of the Chickasaws, was ineffective and that the United States Government was without authority to allot lands to said persons as Choctaw freedmen.

4. Choctaw Nation v. The United States. No. K-187 in the Court of Claims. Filed May 9, 1929.

This case involves but one cause of action, to wit, the right of the Federal Government to use the income from the coal lands and other revenues of the Choctaw Nation in maintaining Indian academies and contract schools. The amount involved is \$1,000,000 and the special attorneys for the Choctaw

Nation proceed upon the theory that this is an illegal use of the common funds and that the payment of sums of money for the maintenance of tribal schools and contract schools is contrary to the treaties entered into with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.

5. The Choctaw Nation v. The United States (No. J-231 in the Court of Claims), filed April 24, 1928.

This case involves the distribution of per capita payments and the amount sued for is \$468,000. The special attorneys for the Choctaw Nation proceed upon the theory that the Federal Government, has disbursed the per capita payments contrary to treaty provisions on an arbitrary apportionment of three-fourths to the Choctaws and one-fourth to the Chickasaws, whereas the different treaties provide that the funds shall be distributed so as to give to each member of the tribes an equal proportion of the tribal funds, and on that theory the Choctaw membership would be entitled to 76.56 per cent and the Chickasaw membership would be entitled to 23.44 per cent, leaving a difference in favor of the Choctaw Indians of 1.56 per cent.

6. The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations v. The United States (No. J-619 of the Court of Claims), filed September 27, 1928.

This is a joint suit in which the nations ask for judgment for \$85,000 with interest thereon from June 28, 1868. The special attorneys for the Choctaw Nation take the position that the \$300,000 set out in article 3 of the treaty of 1866 as the consideration for the cession of certain lands to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations was not in fact paid, but that only \$215,000 was paid and that the nations are entitled to the balance of \$85,000. This does not involve the long-standing controversy as to the right of the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations to recover for what is known as the leased district country, but we simply sue for the balance of the very nominal sum that was supposed to have been paid, but which was in fact never paid.

7. The Choctaw Nation v. The United States (No. K-281 in the Court of Claims), filed June 18, 1929.

This case involves \$1,162,500 as fees and expenses in carrying out the program of allotment, it being the theory of the attorneys for the Choctaw Nation that none of these expenses should have been charged against the Choctaw Nation.

8. The Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations v. The United States of America. No. J-620 in the Court of Claims. Filed September 27, 1928.

This case involves the coal deposits and the segregated coal and asphalt areas and the amount involved is \$8,830,015.01. The special attorneys for the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations take the position that the Federal Government was bound by treaty covenants to sell the coal lands within a fixed period of time and that the lands were not sold and disposed of in accordance with the treaties and that the nations have now been damaged in the sum sued for herein by reason of the failure of the Federal Government to carry out its contract with the Indians.

9. The Choctaw Nation v. The United States. No. K-260 of the Court of Claims. Filed June 3, 1929.

This case is filed in behalf of the Choctaw Nation alone and is a suit for a general account without specifying any particular sums, but asks that the Federal Government be required to make a complete accounting of all transactions and disclose all sums received and all sums paid out for the Choctaw Nation covering the period from 1805 until the present time.

PRESENT STATUS OF SUITS FILED

Accountants were employed on behalf of the tribes who have made a thorough search of the records covering a period of more than a hundred years. This was a tedious job and required more time than could at first be anticipated.

The representatives of the Government contend that in as much as the several jurisdictional acts permit the Government to plead any claim as an offset which it may have against any tribe, that it may plead that as an offset, if any be found, in any suit filed on behalf of any tribe, and they further contend that in making preparation for the trial of any of these suits, they must necessarily make an exhaustive search of all the records of each tribe, and that if preparation for any suit is made separately it would necessitate their going through the records of each tribe as many times as there are suits filed and they insist, therefore, that all suits be filed before the final trial of any of them.

Immediately after all suits have been filed on behalf of all of the Five Civilized Tribes and not later than June 30, 1930, the representatives of the Government assure attorneys for the Five Civilized Tribes and the delegation that they will place accountants at work, going over the records, and checking up the data with the view of having the facts collected and pleadings filed for a trial of all of these suits as soon as this

work can be accomplished. It is anticipated that this preparatory work will be completed as to some of the cases within a few months and as to all within 12 or 18 months when these cases will then be heard by the Court of Claims. No further legislation is necessary by Congress to adjudicate these claims.

Provision is made in each of the jurisdictional acts for an appeal either on behalf of the tribe or the Government from the decision of the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court of the United States.

When these suits shall have been tried, all accounts against the Government will be closed and appropriations will be made to cover any judgment rendered on behalf of any one of the tribes and the money paid out per capita, and the affairs of the tribe finally closed.

In the meantime legislation has been enacted to expedite the sale of the remaining coal and asphalt deposits belonging to the Choctaws and Chickasaws, so that all of the property belonging to these two tribes may be sold and converted into cash and ready for distribution by the time the suits filed on behalf of the tribes are finally decided.

I have actively cooperated with the representatives of all of the five tribes, both officials and attorneys, in the preparation and enactment of all legislation necessary to speedily wind up the affairs of each of these tribes and have insistently urged upon the administrative officers of the Government and the tribes to dispose of all remaining property and adjudicate all claims so that the proceeds may be distributed at an early date to the enrolled members entitled thereto. With the remaining coal and asphalt deposits and other tribal properties sold and the claims against the Government adjudicated as provided in the several jurisdictional bills, the affairs of each of the tribes should be completely wound up and finally closed without further delay.

All members of the Five Civilized Tribes were made citizens of the United States by the act of March 3, 1901, and they actively participate in all local and State affairs in Oklahoma.

They have joined with other splendid citizens, men and women, drawn from every State in the Union and by thrift and industry are assisting in the development of our new and rapidly-growing State. They joined the colors during the World War and contributed their quota in defense of our country and they left a splendid record of service.

They are engaged in every class of business and belong to every profession.

They are interested in the education of their children. Their former governments made generous appropriations from tribal funds for the support of free public schools and for the maintenance of boarding schools. They belong to and assist in the support of churches of all denominations. We are sure that the record they have made justifies the hope that they will continue to keep pace with the onward march of progress and identify themselves with every movement looking to the further development of our State and Nation.

BRIDGE ACROSS LITTLE RIVER NEAR MORRIS FERRY, ARK.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4518) granting the consent of Congress to the Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Little River in the State of Arkansas at or near Morris Ferry, and pass the same, a similar House bill having been reported by the House committee. This is a matter of urgent importance.

The bill authorizes the rebuilding of a railroad bridge which has become so dangerous they can not run their heavy engines over it. It is a bill of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo], who is sick and can not attend to the matter himself.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Co., a corporation organized under and pursuant to the laws of the State of Texas, its successors and assigns, to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge and approaches thereto across the Little River near Morris Ferry, in the State of Arkansas, upon the location of the present bridge and in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to said Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Co., its successors and assigns; and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as full as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE BORDER PATROL ACT OF 1930

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the border-patrol reorganization measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks on the proposed border patrol act of 1930 which is planned for consideration on the floor of the House in the near future. I register my earnest opposition to certain sections of the bill.

After serious study of this bill, H. R. 11204, a bill to regulate entry of persons into the United States and to establish a border patrol in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which, when reported out of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was cited as the "border patrol act of 1930," I find certain "jokers."

I believe that dangers and startling changes will be made in existing laws and great injury done to thousands of innocent American citizens if the bill in its present form is enacted into law.

I believe the measure is loaded with dynamite and that it repeals wise provisions of the navigation laws.

From talking with members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and of the House Rules Committee, I have come to the conclusion that they did not realize the full effect of the provisions if enacted.

The navigation laws are drastically changed, in my opinion, and the bill was not referred as it should have been to the Secretary of Commerce and to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Navigation in the Commerce Department for report and advice.

I believe the bill repeals section 459 of the former tariff act entitled "Imports from Contiguous Countries," which section provided that boats under five tons burden when arriving in the United States from Canada or Mexico need not report to customs unless they carried merchandise purchased abroad.

I also believe that section 441 of the aforesaid tariff act is repealed referring to pleasure yachts under 15 tons burden not being required to report if not carrying dutiable merchandise.

I also believe it repeals the wise provision enacted in 1912 as an amendment to R. S. 4218 providing for the entry of yachts under 15 tons burden without reporting at customs when not carrying dutiable merchandise.

I have many protests from yacht clubs, boat builders, and a marine association on the Great Lakes declaring that H. R. 11204 will do untold damage to them is enacted.

I do not believe the bill should be thrown on the floor in its present condition. It seems it will be difficult to amend so that it does no damage. The border patrol and immigration service can be united wisely, but the bill should not repeal the splendid navigation laws now in force upon the Great Lakes and contiguous rivers, and on the Rio Grande River.

I hope that the Rules Committee, in view of the above facts, will reconsider its action to have H. R. 11204 follow the urgent deficiency bill.

It would appear to be the part of wisdom to have proper amendments to the bill ready for consideration before it is presented to the House.

I am certain that various Members who participated in consenting to allow the bill to reach the floor did not know that it would probably repeal wise navigation laws which were placed on the books after many years of experience and very careful consideration.

I am placing in the RECORD under permission to extend my remarks on this bill telegrams and letters of protest against this bill and a further explanation of its vicious features as it exists in its present form.

I insert a telegram dated February 19, nearly four months ago, showing that there was something in the wind to change the existing navigation laws and that the small boat people feared the injury from such a change. The telegram is from the president of the Marine Industries Association, and is as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., February 19, 1930.

Congressman ROBERT CLANCY,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand Colonel Pickert in Washington relative proposal requiring all pleasure boats to report at customs on entering American waters. Acting for Marine Industries Association, composed of practically all

boat and marine engine companies Detroit area, I respectfully request your support in opposition to this proposal.

L. H. THOMSON,
President Marine Industries Association.

This association, through its secretary, W. D. Edenburn, telegraphs me under date of June 17 as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., June 17, 1930.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

This association appreciates your opposition to administration border patrol bill. Have brought this to the attention of other Michigan Congressmen. Will appreciate your continued efforts to defeat this measure, which will work hardship on entire boating industry in Michigan and other Lake States.

MARINE INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION.
W. D. EDENBURN, Secretary.

I also insert other telegrams and letters showing the damage the proposed bill will do on the Great Lakes and contiguous rivers:

ROSEVILLE, MICH., June 18, 1930.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,
Representative, Washington, D. C.:

Through the press we are advised of the bill introduced by Representative GRANT M. HUDSON relative to the proposed border patrol bill of the administration. The yachting division of this club wishes to go on record as being absolutely opposed to the conditions of the proposed bill in so far as it will affect the legitimate activities of the yachting fraternity.

LAKE SHORE COUNTRY CLUB,
ANDREW G. SCHLEE, Commodore.

ROSEVILLE, MICH., June 18, 1930.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,
Representative, Washington, D. C.:

Through the press we are advised of the bill introduced by Representative GRANT M. HUDSON relative to the proposed border patrol bill of the administration. This club wishes to go on record as being absolutely opposed to the conditions of the proposed bill in so far as it will affect the legitimate activities of the yachting fraternity.

LAKE SHORE COUNTRY CLUB,
By GEORGE J. HAAS, President.

DETROIT, MICH., April 21, 1930.

Congressman ROBERT H. CLANCY:

The Edison Boat Club, Detroit, Mich., are not in favor of Hudson bill closing Canadian and Mexican border to traffic for American citizens; conditions are bad enough now.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

DETROIT, MICH., June 17, 1930.

HON. ROBERT CLANCY,
House of Representatives:

Yachtsmen protest border patrol bill as applied pleasure craft.

JAMES T. MCMILLAN.

Mr. McMillan is president of the Detroit & Buffalo Navigation Co. and also an officer of the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. which operate a fleet of the largest fresh-water boats in the world.

ALGONAC, MICH., April 23, 1930.

The honorable Congressman ROBERT H. CLANCY,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CLANCY: I want to thank you first for the interest you are taking in your home territory trying to protect your constituents and leaving a little bit of free air to breathe in.

Your telegram was right when you said the Hudson bill would be obnoxious. As you know there are thousands of people boating around Detroit, the upper end of Lake Erie, the south shore of Lake Erie, and Lake St. Clair, and as far north as the Straits of Mackinaw, both in Canadian and American waters.

Take our own case here. On the Canadian side of Lake St. Clair there is some wonderful fishing grounds. It is a very common occurrence to see from 10 to 25 fishermen, all at one time, and all Americans, fishing in the Canadian waters for pleasure. They would be 12 or 14 miles from a Canadian custom port, the closest away they could get for a clearance.

In my own case, during the months of July and August I do a lot of pole fishing; get up here and leave with a partner and companion of some kind at 5 o'clock in the morning, go down to the Canadian side of Lake St. Clair and fish until 9, 10, or 12 o'clock, and come back home. In case I had to clear from here before I went into Canadian waters and report back, the custom office would not be open that early in the morning, and it would necessitate driving 14 or 15 miles to get to a Canadian office to report in or clear out, and on the whole, this

law is going to be very cumbersome to a great many people on the American side of the river.

There is not one boat out of 20 that brings goods out of Canada or persons out of Canada to the United States and I can see no particular reason for this law. The American side along the St. Clair River is amply protected with prohibition officers and immigration officers. You can stand on the street and about every hour either one of the two departments will drive by with a car.

I do not know whether Mr. HUDSON realizes the situation that this country is in or not, but the majority of the citizens of Michigan are getting very tired of new laws. They have got it so plastered now that I do not believe we have an honest man left in the State of Michigan that is living up to all the laws.

I do not care to bore you any longer with this letter, but I do hope you will do everything in your power to kill this Hudson bill. I am going to send Mr. HUDSON a copy of this letter, and I am sure if there were more people along the borders of Michigan that knew of this bill he would get thousands of letters asking him to withdraw the bill.

It is not only going to be a pleasure killer but it is going to set the boat business back financially around the chain of Lakes and on the borders.

If at any time I can be of any use to you, politically or otherwise, I do not want you to hesitate to call on me, because I feel very grateful, as I have stated above, for the interest you are taking in your home territory.

Sincerely yours,

CHRIS SMITH & SONS BOAT CO.,
CHRIS SMITH.

The owners of yacht clubs, the boat builders, and the owners of small boats in the Great Lakes region are more or less familiar with the efforts of the prohibition enforcement officers to interfere with their innocent pleasures and their rights under the law.

The customs-border patrol out of Detroit attempted to make small-boat owners believe that they had to report to customs after a visit to Canada and even if they had not purchased merchandise abroad. The officers even went so far as to seize boats and levy fines on what was really a fake law, as the real law granted the boat owner immunity when he was not engaged in or attempting to smuggle merchandise purchased abroad.

The prohibition enforcement officers went even further in an attempt to harass innocent boat owners by claiming that they had to carry a certificate of title. There was no law requiring such permits, and the prohibition officers then invented a fake law which they used to harass innocent American boat owners on the Detroit River. I forced the customs officials to abandon both of these practices and to abate these nuisances.

Rear Admiral F. C. Billard, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard tried to make me believe that the law did require the carrying of a certificate of title—this was in the case of Coast Guard inspectors firing upon the speed boat of Lawrence P. Fisher off Wyandotte last summer. Mr. Fisher is president of the Cadillac Motor Car Co. and several shots were fired from the decks of a Coast Guard boat at Mr. Fisher's speed boat which was being navigated by Mr. Fisher's captain and a friend. At the time Rear Admiral Billard wrote me a whitewash of the incident and said that Mr. Fisher should be glad that his boat was not held inasmuch as it did not carry a certificate of title.

The examination showed that the boat carried all necessary navigating equipment such as life preservers, fire extinguishers, whistle, pilot rules, and so forth. Thereupon the Coast Guard invented the fake law requiring certificate of title.

I now insert in the RECORD a letter showing that the Customs Office did seize small boats and imposed fines on them in violation of law. This letter is from Acting Collector of Customs of Michigan, Walter S. Petty, and is as follows:

[Office of the Collector, District No. 38. Address all communications for this office to the collector]

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE,
Detroit, Mich., October 25, 1929.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,
823 Majestic Building, Detroit, Mich.

Sir: Reference is made to a letter from F. L. Colby, jr., dated October 18, which you handed to me this morning in connection with a fine assessed against his speedboat, which is under 5 net tons, of \$100 for failure to report to the customs upon his return from Canada on July 4, 1929. For your information, I am quoting the section of the tariff act under which this fine was assessed, as follows:

"SEC. 459. Imports from contiguous countries: Report. The master of any vessel of less than 5 net tons carrying merchandise and the person in charge of any vehicle arriving in the United States from contiguous country, shall immediately report his arrival to the

customs officer at the port of entry or customhouse which shall be nearest to the place at which such vessel or vehicle shall cross the boundary line or shall enter the territorial waters of the United States, and if such vessel or vehicle have on board any merchandise, shall produce to such customs officer a manifest as required by law, and no such vessel or vehicle shall proceed further inland nor shall discharge or land any merchandise, passengers, or baggage without receiving a permit therefor from such customs officer. The master of any such vessel, or the person in charge of any such vehicle who falls to report arrival in the United States as required by the provisions of this section shall be subject to a fine of \$100 for each offense, and if any merchandise or baggage is unladen or discharged from any such vessel or vehicle without permit therefor, the same, together with the vessel or vehicle in which imported, shall be subject to forfeiture."

It appears that Mr. Colby was assessed and paid a fine of \$100 for violation of the above-mentioned section, in view of the fact that he did not have any merchandise aboard at the time of his arrival in the United States.

The Treasury Department, in a ruling dated subsequent to the time this matter was referred to the Department of Commerce, held that pleasure craft which were carrying no merchandise and which were under 5 net tons need not report their arrival on returning from Canada. It would, therefore, appear that the mitigated penalty of \$10 which Mr. Colby paid was erroneously assessed. As there is a difference of opinion between the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce as to such penalties, this office will again take Mr. Colby's case up with the Secretary of Commerce with the idea of having the \$10 refunded to Mr. Colby.

I will keep you posted as to the results accomplished in this case.

Mr. Colby's letter is returned herewith.

Respectfully,

WALTER S. PETTY, Acting Collector.

The proposed Hudson bill would give much more extensive authority to interfere with the movements of innocent citizens than under existing law—that is the covert and furtive purpose of the bill.

If the border patrol consisted of tactful, courteous, honest, intelligent agents and inspectors a reign of terror might be mitigated, but Michiganders know from bitter experience that too many of these enforcement officers are brutal, officious, overbearing, and inclined to get drunk on duty and prone to graft as much as possible.

Innocent citizens have been fired upon and some have been murdered. The tale of brutality and graft is too long to recite here, but I am inserting in the RECORD an official report of the United States Civil Service Commission under date of April 8, 1930, on the activities of some border-patrol officers whom I had investigated. The brutal treatment of an old letter carrier and his subsequent death are recited here in detail. The two officers had no search warrant when they entered his boathouse on his property, where he was innocently drinking a few glasses of beer in his sorrow over his father's death. Here is recited the brutal attack upon a citizen whom the two agents suspected of being a lookout for rum runners. They handcuffed him to a tree, knocked out some of his teeth, and beat him cruelly.

The almost unbelievable feature of this lawlessness is that the superior officers condone and defend such agents, shield them from dismissal, and maintain that they are good men.

There can be no hope of courteous treatment in the future from such agents. To give them more power would be like giving a beast of prey a taste of human blood.

I herewith insert the aforesaid report from the United States Civil Service Commission:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1930.

HON. ROBERT H. CLANCY,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CLANCY: In letter to you of March 12 the commission stated that its records showed with respect to the service of Willis W. McNabb, customs patrol inspector at Detroit, and stated that the facts you cited about Mr. McNabb were matters of internal administration within the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, regarding which this commission had no duty or authority.

Since that letter was written the following statement has been received relative to Gordon Suthard and Sergeant McNabb:

"From the signed testimony of Sergt. Willis McNabb in the files of the Special Agency Service, 1012 Buhl Building, Detroit, Mich., relative to the drowning of Al Smith, rural mail carrier, Grosse Ile, Mich.

"I started out at 8.30 a. m. from the customs patrol base with Gordon Suthard on free-lance duty and drove down the river. I crossed the bridge at Grosse Ile, which is 20 miles from Detroit, opposite Wyandotte, Mich. The police officer at the bridge informed me that there was considerable activity at the Willows near Smith's boathouse, which is near the southern part of the island. When we reached that point I saw a light in a boathouse on the west side of a cut, and we drove around the

end of the cut and approached the place. This was about 10.30 p. m., September 4, 1929. I went to the boathouse and found that the door was not padlocked. I rattled the latch. A man said, 'Who is there?' I replied, 'Customs patrol inspectors' and opened the door. I saw a burlap sack on the floor, which evidently contained bottled beer (this was later found to be true), also a jug with about a pint of whisky in it. I said that we would have to search the place. While my partner and I were looking around, the man dashed out of the door and ran. I ran after him and brought him back. He struggled, and my partner wanted to hit him over the head, but I told him not to do so. We finally got the handcuffs on him. This occurred outside on the door of the boathouse. My partner thought that he heard a noise back by the car and went to look. The man, who seemed quiet, went into the boathouse. Suddenly he turned off the electric lights in the boathouse. I called for my partner and went inside. Before I could find the switch the man had jumped into the boat well and I could hear him splashing around under the floor of the boathouse. We got an axe from the car and pried up some of the boards in the boathouse, but couldn't find him. We then went outside and looked out into the cut. We saw his head, and he appeared to be swimming. Suddenly he disappeared. After some time we got a boat, but couldn't find the man. Then we got help and dragged for him with a pole fitted with hooks on one end. We got him on the first attempt. This was at 1.20 a. m., September 5, 1929. I called the fire department, and in 20 minutes had a pulmotor, but a doctor declared the man dead, and his body was turned over to the coroner."

Statement of C. E. Wyatt, customs agent in charge of the special agency service, at that time assistant agent in charge.

"This was an unfortunate case. The customs patrol men didn't know who the man was in the boathouse and he didn't make himself known to them. I personally attended the autopsy with H. E. Trimble, surgeon, medical officer in charge, United States Public Health Service. Weeds and sand were found in Mr. Smith's lungs, which indicated that death occurred from drowning and not from any blow. There were no bruises on the body to indicate that he had been hit."

Statement of Postmaster Graves, Grosse Ile, Mich., relative to the drowning of Al Smith, rural carrier, Grosse Ile, Mich.

"I had a phone call from Al Smith about 10 or 11 p. m., September 4, 1929, to the effect that his father had died and that he would be away several days. I agreed to notify the subcarrier. I could see that he was all broken up over his father's death. He thought a lot of his father and often had him for long visits on the island. I went right to bed after the phone call and knew nothing of the drowning until next morning, when I went over to see Mrs. Smith. She said that Mr. Smith had felt his father's death deeply and couldn't go to sleep after the telegram was received. He walked around the house and finally went down to the boathouse. Mrs. Smith sat on the front porch to wait for him. She didn't know of the drowning until men notified her. The house is quite a long ways from the boathouse. I don't think that the customs men killed Mr. Smith and threw him into the water as some believe, but I do think that they should have made more of an effort to save him, as the water was shallow and they could have waded out to him. I also can't believe that they didn't know Al Smith, as he had been the only rural carrier on the island for a long time, was known to all and very well liked. He never had anything to do with bootleggers and would not let them land at his place. He drank, but never while on duty.

"I couldn't see Chief of Police Peabody on Grosse Ile. He has no office and wasn't at home when I called. No one could tell me where he could be found. I had the subcarrier drive me down to the cut where the boathouse is located. It sets out over the water on posts and is a double boathouse made of galvanized iron. The cut is about 60 feet wide and shallow. The subcarrier waded out with knee boots on for some distance and the water was only about 3 feet deep. I don't see how Mr. Smith could have drowned unless he slipped on the muddy bottom and couldn't save himself because of the handcuffs. It seems strange that the officers didn't know Al Smith. There are only three boathouses on the cut. The officers were directed there by the policemen and evidently knew where to go. If they did know him, it was unnecessary to handcuff him, as he could be easily found. As to the depth of the water, they may not have known this, and it is almost impossible to swim in the customs patrol uniforms, which are tight at the knee and hold water. I personally knew Al Smith. He was formerly a mail carrier in the Detroit post office. He always drank, and the postmaster here has warned him to stop drinking while on duty or steps would be taken toward his removal. He resigned from the Detroit force a long time ago and secured an appointment as rural carrier at Grosse Ile, Mich. He would have been due for retirement in two or three years. He was well liked by everyone. He made a little extra money by renting fishing boats. I believe that he would always have something around in the way of beer or liquor, but at the times that he called at the post office here he never said anything that would lead me to think that he had anything to do with the bootleggers. I have been told that Suthard and McNabb would stay out for 14 hours at a time. They started out this time at 8.30 in the morning and were still touring around at 10.30 at night. They liked

the work. Suthard is uneducated, and this work offered a great field for him in work which he thoroughly enjoys. They are both of an aggressive type, and would be in trouble at times unless restrained. He was let go March 15, 1930."

Statement of Norman McLean, Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. watchman, concerning his trouble with the customs patrol in January, 1930, at the foot of Twenty-fourth Street, Detroit:

"I am employed as watchman by the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. and was assigned last winter to the foot of Twenty-fourth Street, where two of the large passenger boats were tied up for the winter. The space between Twenty-fourth and Twenty-fifth Streets along the river front and for a block back is owned by the city. It is fenced in and is used as a playground for the children by the department of recreation, except for a hundred-foot strip along the dock, which is rented by the Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co. for their boats to tie-up at during the winter. On January 1, 1930, there was a heavy snow which melted a little later and left the ground soft. The wire gates couldn't be closed tight because of the snow, so I used a chain and padlock to keep them partially closed. My instructions were to keep the gates locked. The customs patrol men had been accustomed to drive through from Twenty-fourth to Twenty-fifth Street, but I found that their car was cutting ruts in the soft ground, so I asked them to leave their car outside and walk in. The gates were open far enough to allow a man to pass and were held together by a chain. These customs patrol men were Sergeant McNabb and Inspector McGuire. McNabb said, 'Try and lock those gates and I will shoot off the lock. I suppose you keep them locked to protect bootleggers.' I answered, 'If you got \$10 from a bootlegger, you wouldn't come around here at all.' They got an ax from their car and broke off the lock. McNabb said, 'Just try and lock that gate again.' I said that I would as soon as I got a lock, and with that they handcuffed me and were going to lock me up. I said to wait until I could call up, as the boats would be unprotected. They refused and took me with them. They didn't seem to know what to do with me. They drove around and talked to other customs patrols, and finally took me to the patrol base. I was allowed to call up Captain MacDonald, of the Detroit & Cleveland, and he came down in a couple of hours. The lieutenant at the patrol base said to let me go, and promised Captain MacDonald that I would not be bothered again."

Statement of W. K. Muir, general superintendent D. & C. Navigation Co., foot of Wayne Street, Detroit, Mich., regarding trouble at the foot of Twenty-fourth Street with the customs patrol:

"It was on January 4 or 5 that our watchman, McLean, was arrested by customs patrol men because he wouldn't let them drive through the passageway along the river front from Twenty-fourth to Twenty-fifth Street. Our watchman was instructed to keep the gates locked, but the customs inspectors could walk through at any time. They broke open the gate, arrested our watchman, left over \$1,000,000 worth of property unprotected, left their post of duty all for a little matter which could have been adjusted in other ways the next day. When our man failed to ring his boxes the Still Alarm placed a man in charge, otherwise our insurance would be canceled. I wrote to Colonel Pickert, collector of customs, and he agreed to look into the matter. We have not been bothered since and seldom have trouble. We try to cooperate with the customs officials at all times."

Statement of Captain Meno, fleet captain for the D. & C. Navigation Co., regarding trouble with customs patrol men:

"I am in charge of the boats when they tie up and supervise the loading of the freight. The customs patrol men used to drive through our warehouse and along the dock, endangering the freight that was piled around. The docks and warehouse were crowded during the summer, and there was only a narrow passageway. In driving through, these patrol men would splash mud on the freight, and there was a great risk of their running into some of the cars awaiting shipment. I refused to allow them to drive through, but said that they could walk around all they like. I am always willing to cooperate and have notified the customs base when I saw any bootleggers around."

Statement of Linus von Batchelder, customs-patrol inspector, Detroit, Mich., regarding trouble between D. & C. Navigation Co. watchman and customs-patrol inspector at the foot of Twenty-fourth Street, this city:

"Inspector McGuire and Sergeant McNabb were the men who had that trouble. The watchman wouldn't let them drive through the driveway because the ground was soft and driving cut up the roadway. The custom men broke off the lock to the gate and arrested the watchman. They stopped me on my patrol and asked what I would do. They were headed for the police station to lock the watchman up. I advised them to let him go, as he hadn't done anything, or to call the base. They took the man to the base and the lieutenant let him go. McNabb is a good man and honest, but too excitable at times and goes to extremes."

"It appears to me that Sergeant McNabb has a very aggressive disposition, and from what I saw of Norman McLean, I judge that he is of the same type. They naturally would not get along nor come to any mutual agreement. I spoke to the D. & C. watchman, who alternates with McLean, and he has had no trouble. He says that he allows the customs-patrol men to open the gate themselves and leaves the key handy on the post. I think that Sergeant McNabb used poor judgment in forcing an issue which should be adjusted by his superiors."

Statement of Linus von Batchelder, customs-patrol inspector, in regard to the "beating up" of a man on the east side by Sergeant McNabb in November or December, 1929:

"The injured man was a lookout for one of the big bootleggers. There is no doubt of that. McNabb and one of the other inspectors caught him, handcuffed him around a tree, and hit him, knocking out several teeth. They then put him in jail and on the next day the man was let go by J. Stanley Hurd, United States commissioner. There was no charge on which the man could be convicted."

"I believe that Sergeant McNabb will get in trouble from time to time just as long as he is allowed to have a free hand, as his judgment is poor, although he undoubtedly is honest and an energetic worker."

There are inclosed two newspaper statements.

You will appreciate that the commission can not undertake to pass upon the truth of the facts stated.

By direction of the commission.

Very respectfully,

JOHN T. DOYLE, *Secretary*.

I have also had prepared a memorandum from the Commissioner of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of Commerce on the present laws governing the entry of small boats into American waters. It shows clearly that similar boats are exempted from the port at customhouses when they are not carrying dutiable merchandise purchased abroad. The report is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
Washington, June 18, 1930.

Memorandum for Mr. CLANCY.

Referring to your telephone call in regard to the entry and clearance of small vessels on the Great Lakes, your attention is invited to the following:

Section 4218, Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of August 20, 1912, reads as follows:

"Every yacht, except those of 15 gross tons or under, visiting a foreign country under the provisions of sections 4214, 4215, and 4217 of the Revised Statutes shall, on her return to the United States, make due entry at the customhouse of the port at which on such return she shall arrive: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to exempt the master or person in charge of a yacht or vessel arriving from a foreign port or place with dutiable articles on board from reporting to the customs officer of the United States at the port or place at which said yacht or vessel shall arrive, and deliver it to said officer a manifest of all dutiable articles brought from a foreign country in such yachts or vessels."

Section 441 of the tariff act of 1922 in enumerating the vessels not required to enter includes the following:

"(3) Yachts of 15 gross tons or under not permitted by law to carry merchandise or passengers for hire."

Section 459 of the tariff act of 1922 reads as follows:

"Imports from contiguous countries—Report: The master of any vessel of less than 5 net tons carrying merchandise, and the person in charge of any vehicle arriving in the United States from contiguous country, shall immediately report his arrival to the customs officer at the port of entry or customhouse which shall be nearest to the place at which such vessel or vehicle shall cross the boundary line or shall enter the territorial waters of the United States, and if such vessel or vehicle have on board any merchandise, shall produce to such customs officer a manifest as required by law, and no such vessel or vehicle shall proceed farther inland nor shall discharge or land any merchandise, passengers, or baggage without receiving a permit therefor from such customs officer. The master of any such vessel, or the person in charge of any such vehicle who fails to report arrival in the United States as required by the provisions of this section shall be subject to a fine of \$100 for each offense, and if any merchandise or baggage is unladen or discharged from any such vessel or vehicle without a permit therefor the same, together with the vessel or vehicle in which imported, shall be subject to forfeiture."

A. J. TYLER, *Commissioner*.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will call attention to the fact that this is Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope the gentleman will not press his request at this time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Naval Affairs Committee has the call to-day and they have a great many important bills, and I trust the gentleman will withdraw his request.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that later on during the session to-day, if I have time to yield in general debate, I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLIS. Can the gentleman do that to-day?

Mr. BRITTEN. I can not tell that now, but later on it may develop that I will be able to do so.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a speech in my system that I want to extricate at the earliest possible moment. If it is not convenient at this time and it will expedite business to have the speech made later in the day, of course, I shall not press my request.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say to the gentleman that I will be pleased to yield to him later in the day if it is possible.

Mr. ELLIS. The gentleman does not encourage me very much as to the possibilities.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am trying to encourage the gentleman as much as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not think he should entertain such a request at this time.

PROMOTION OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE LINE OF THE NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the list of committees.

Mr. BRITTEN (when the Committee on Naval Affairs was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1190) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the line of the Navy, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the consideration of the bill, because it does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report of the committee does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. PATTERSON. And I reserve the right to object to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. This is an amendment to existing law, and the existing law is not set out in the report.

Mr. GARNER. If it is not set out in the report it is a clear violation of the rule.

Mr. BRITTEN. The bill itself complies with the Ramseyer law.

Mr. COLLINS. But the report does not comply with it.

Mr. GARNER. The Ramseyer rule applies to the report.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the bill is a part of the report by reference.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Ramseyer rule provides:

Whenever a committee reports a bill or a joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(1) The text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) A comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by stricken-through type and italics, parallel columns, or other appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

The Chair will notice that this bill does more than one thing—it not only repeals the proviso as found in section 1 but it goes on and provides for substantive legislation amending and repealing existing law.

The purpose of the rule was to aid members of the House in being able to determine, without searching the statutes, wherein the proposed legislation amends existing law.

This bill is a very extensive bill in many of its provisions. All throughout it changes existing law. Granting, for the sake of argument, as far as the first section goes, that the House would be informed as to what is purported to be done, other parts of the bill do not carry such information. This is a most flagrant violation of the rules, it seems to me.

Mr. COLLINS. And section 10 clearly violates the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is ready to rule. Section 9 of the bill provides:

The provision in the act approved August 29, 1916, prescribing maximum age limits for the promotion of captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders is hereby repealed.

The fact that the provision just read is not set out in the report violates the rule to such an extent that the Chair is obliged to sustain the point of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order, and the bill automatically is referred to the committee for a report in accordance with the rules.

ADJUSTING THE SALARIES OF THE NAVAL ACADEMY BAND

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 10380) adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader with the pay and allowances of a lieutenant, senior grade, United States Navy; one second leader with the pay and allowances of a warrant officer; and of such enlisted men and in such ratings as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the ratings and the proportionate distribution among the ratings of the enlisted men shall be substantially the same as in the Navy Band: *Provided further*, That the leader, assistant leader, and the enlisted men of the Naval Academy Band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are or hereafter may become applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report on this bill violates the so-called Ramseyer rule, in that it does not furnish the information required by that rule. It does not state what is sought to be amended by this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair does not find in this bill a repeal or amendment of any statute whatever. Therefore the Chair rules that the Ramseyer rule does not apply in this case.

This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PATTERSON. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HOOPER in the chair. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GAMBRILL].

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, while this bill is denoted as one to adjust the salaries of the Naval Academy Band, it is in fact a bill designed to remove a legislative tangle so as to give the Navy Department the authority to place the band on the same status as the Navy Band here in Washington.

By this bill, if enacted into law, the Navy Department will have the right to assign to that band such enlisted men as it deems proper and to establish the ratings of the men.

It does not interfere with the rights and prerogatives of the Joint Pay Committee recently created by Congress, as the function of that committee will be to fix the pay basis for the existing ratings of the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and other services.

This bill received the unanimous indorsement of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and its relation to the probable action of the Joint Pay Committee was considered, and this legislation was deemed necessary, regardless of what action might be taken by the Joint Pay Committee in its adjustment of the pay of the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and the allied services.

By an act of July 11, 1919, the complement of the Naval Academy Band was fixed by law as: 1 leader; 1 second leader; 1 drum major; 45 musicians, first class; 27 musicians, second class.

By an act of March 4, 1925, the band was brought under the joint service pay act of June 10, 1922, and the pay of the band was so fixed by that act, with the result, however, that the complement of the band and its ratings were restricted by the act of July 11, 1919, to 45 musicians of the first class and 27 musicians of the second class.

As the Navy Department said, in the hearing on this bill, this has created a very rigid situation in that the act of July 11, 1919, created a given number of musicians of specified classes, and no promotion can be made unless vacancies exist, and no transfers can be made to the band unless vacancies exist. "It is a disadvantage when it comes to putting good men there." This bill was drafted by the Navy Department on the request of the chair-

man of the committee, and has its approval. The effect will be to place the Naval Academy Band on the same status as the Navy Band and the legislation is necessary, regardless of any action taken by the Joint Pay Committee.

The Joint Pay Committee will, I assume, take the rating of the officers and enlisted men as they stand and as they are fixed by law, and will propose legislation to increase or decrease the pay of the respective ratings. That is to say, they will take the grade or rating of the officers as they find them, such as ensigns, lieutenants, lieutenant commanders, commanders, captains, and admirals, and determine if the pay in the respective grades or ratings should be increased or reduced.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. GAMBRILL. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman spoke about the increase or the decrease. Does he think this committee is going to do any decreasing to amount to anything?

Mr. GAMBRILL. I do not care to prophesy as to what the Joint Pay Committee will do.

Mr. PATTERSON. I admit it would be a rather hazardous thing to do.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Then they will take the enlisted personnel of the Navy, such as apprentice seamen; seamen, second class; seaman, first class; petty officers and chief petty officers, and arrive at the same determination.

It is hardly possible that the Joint Pay Committee will reconstruct the grades and ratings of the officers and enlisted men. To do so would be to rewrite a tremendous amount of legislation. Unless you allow your legislative committee to propose legislation to correct this legislative tangle, which exists so far as the Naval Academy Band is concerned, then we are going to have this band left out of the picture as it was when the joint pay act of June 10, 1922, was passed.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBRILL. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Is not the only effect of this bill to put the Naval Academy Band on the same rating as the Navy Band here in Washington?

Mr. GAMBRILL. That is what we propose by the bill, and that is all it proposes to do.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are trying to have this Naval Academy Band have identically the same rating along with the Navy Band here in Washington.

Mr. GAMBRILL. That is it exactly.

Mr. PATTERSON. What is it that is so urgent about this that it can not wait until the Joint Pay Committee makes its report?

Mr. GAMBRILL. The Joint Pay Committee will not take into consideration the legislation which created this band. It will take into consideration the personnel as they find it, and the grades as they find them and determine the question as to whether the pay is too small or too great.

Mr. PATTERSON. Would it not be well to wait until after their report is made and see what they do, or, if you do not do that, there will be lots of this special legislation just like this and the gentleman from Georgia must know that.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is not anything for the gentleman from Alabama to get excited about.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am not any more excited than is the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are merely trying to do justice to these two organizations, and the Joint Pay Committee has no jurisdiction over the ratings. The Joint Pay Committee deals with nothing in the world but the question of pay. It naturally follows that you must have your rating correct before you can bring in your bill to fix the pay. There is no assurance that the Joint Pay Committee will increase the pay of the Naval Academy Band or of the Navy Band.

Mr. PATTERSON. And there is no assurance that they will not do it.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any member of the Committee on Naval Affairs who desires recognition in opposition to the bill?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any gentleman on the committee is opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho in opposition for one hour.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, in February of this year the Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing a Joint Pay Committee to be appointed, representing the Senate and the House for the purpose of considering and reporting back to Congress possible legislation touching the question of pay for several

services, including the very service to which reference is made in the bill now before the committee. At different times during the last several months it has been my duty, as I saw it, to call the attention of the House to the action of the Naval Legislative Committee in reporting bills seeking to do precisely the thing in part that the Congress has asked the joint committee to do, namely, to report to the Congress a program involving pay of military and kindred services with the thought of bringing about harmony and equality in pay within the services.

One of the greatest difficulties that confronts that committee to-day is in meeting inequalities that exist in the different services with which the committee is concerned. The general policy that has been followed by Congress for years of reporting and considering propositions of like character at different times has led to that very situation. A bill is reported, for instance, by the Military Affairs Committee which provides certain conditions, certain benefits, pay, retirement, promotion, for certain branches of the Army. Under the proposed bill it may be that conditions will be better than the conditions established for the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. These other services immediately seek to enjoy similar benefits. If they can not be included within the same bill, they do not oppose. They are delighted to permit the bill to pass, even though a more favored condition be given to the Army than to themselves, with the thought that in the very next Congress they will come forward and ask for readjustment so that they may receive the benefits of that preferred service. That is the problem that is confronting us in considering the pay bill at this time—the conflict that has been wrought in laws through special legislation being brought before the Congress and passed, pertaining to one activity, to one service, regardless of other services, and then the demand on the part of other services that their conditions be brought up to equal the conditions of the preferred class.

If the Members of the House will read the report that has been submitted in support of this bill, they will at once recognize the vice at which I am directing the attention of the House. In what respect does the report justify and upon what does it base the pay bill for the Naval Academy? Upon the theory that under present law we are paying more to some other band. That is the point. We are paying more, so the report says, to the Navy Band, and we are paying more to the Marine Band. In other words, we are attempting to do by piecemeal that which will come up to plague us when some other institution of similar character feels that we are not providing for its members as liberally as we are providing for some other branch.

Instead of waiting until the time when we can report out a bill which will take care of all such conditions, the Committee on Naval Affairs now reports out a bill proposing to do by piecemeal that which has been given to the joint committee to do.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Has the Joint Pay Committee jurisdiction to do what this bill does?

Mr. FRENCH. In the main it has.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then why did the gentleman seek yesterday to give the joint committee similar jurisdiction? The Joint Pay Committee has no authority at all to deal with the rating of any service but has to deal exclusively with the question of pay. No committee except a legislative committee has the right to submit to Congress anything except the rates.

Mr. FRENCH. I do not agree with that at all. If the Joint Pay Committee has any responsibility whatever, it has the responsibility to report out just such propositions as are involved in large part in the bill now pending before the House.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho has used 6 minutes and yields back 54 minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 54 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in the closing hours of the session, while the temperature in this Chamber is very agreeable for long-distance speaking, nevertheless I would not offend by attempting to take up all the time at my disposal. And yet I think in justice to the membership of this committee, in view of the controversy between the Naval Committee and the Joint Pay Committee, it is well to consider whether the contention of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] is well taken or not; whether this bill, if it is passed, will not be primarily a pay promotion bill.

I have heard on certain occasions murmurs of criticism against the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member. But the Committee on Military Affairs from the very beginning, and particularly since this Congress decreed that we

would not provide for any increase, either directly or indirectly, awaiting the report of the Joint Pay Committee, the Committee on Military Affairs has refrained from reporting any bill for promotion involving increased pay. We think that the will of the House should be observed, and the committee has adopted a legislative program in effect that all matters pertaining to promotion and increased pay in the Army and Navy and Marine Corps and the other allied services shall be suspended until the report of the joint committee is made.

What does this bill do? This bill was reported from the Navy Department before the Congress made its recommendation and decision that we should suspend all matters of promotion and increased pay until the report of that joint committee was made. This bill, of course, is one of those bills that arise out of the propinquity of Congress to the Naval Academy at Annapolis. The Committee on Military Affairs are rather fortunate, in that we are farther remote from the Military Academy than the Members from Maryland are from the Naval Academy.

Before we created the joint committee this bill in substance was referred to the Navy Department. The department has reported rather adversely to this bill in its present form. The department recommends that the Naval Academy Band should have one leader with the pay and allowances of a lieutenant of the senior grade, but this bill goes directly in the face of the recommendation of the Navy Department, in that it says there shall be also a second leader with the pay and allowances of the junior grade. I challenge the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs to say I am in error in that assertion. If anyone claims that I am in error I will read from the report supporting my position.

Mr. GAMBRILL. The bill to which the gentleman refers is one of the original bills introduced. The present bill meets the approval of the Navy Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in the RECORD that goes to show that, or in the report that supports the position of the author of this bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Surely.

Mr. BRITTEN. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin always desires to be fair. The fact is that there was an original bill introduced to do this unimportant thing, and that is to give the Naval Academy Band the same component parts that the Navy Band and the Marine Band have, only a lesser number. That original bill was submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, and it came back to the committee with an adverse recommendation; that is, the department recommended against that particular bill. Then, by request of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Navy Department prepared the bill which is now before the House. We have no recommendation from the department on this bill, but I will say that the Navy Department prepared this bill and is in favor of its passage.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am rather surprised at that statement in view of the letter of the Acting Secretary of the Navy, under date of January 11 of this year, which letter controverts the position of the gentleman.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Speaking about flexibility in the Navy Band and lack of flexibility in the Naval Academy Band, Admiral Leigh, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, said at the hearing:

We have that flexibility in the Navy Band. Our hands are not tied as to ratings we put in the Navy Band. This Naval Academy Band is the only place anywhere in the Navy, so far as I know, where it specifies that certain ratings shall make up the unit.

Admiral Leigh had in mind when he made that statement the act of July 11, 1919, which made the complement of the band as 45 musicians of the first class and 27 musicians of the second class.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say in all seriousness to the membership of this House that if I thought the House would not recognize the mandate that the House gave to the Joint Committee on Pay to determine what should be the pay of the respective services of all the various activities of the Government, I would have taken it upon myself to determine whether this pay bill is on a parity or disparity with the Army Band at West Point. However, the incident exemplifies the rivalry between the respective services. We are trying to get away from it in the joint pay bill. The Committee on Military Affairs has conformed to the action of Congress in not reporting any promotion bill.

When you say that the leader shall get the pay of a lieutenant of the junior grade, and the joint committee is going to pass upon the salary of that junior grade, you can see readily that this is a pay bill direct. I do not think this House should affront the sincere and serious efforts being made by the Joint

Committee on Pay, of which the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] is chairman, by passing legislation that will violate the fundamentals of the work of that joint committee. What is \$15,000? Very little in these days when we are appropriating millions and hundreds of millions; but that committee will take up the question as to the pay of the leader of this band, the pay of the leader of the Marine Corps Band, the pay of the leader of the Army Band, in connection with their work. When we know nothing of the respective pay for these other services, why should we now, when we have delegated that authority to a committee which has authority to do that work, take it away from them and embarrass them? I think it is most inopportune for us to launch into that question. This is essentially a question to provide for increased pay, by providing increased rank for the leader and second leader of the Naval Academy Band. I think this matter could well be deferred until the report of the joint committee.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] suggested in various ways that this legislation should not be passed, because it conflicted completely with the resolution that was passed by the House providing for the Joint Pay Committee to do certain things; that is, to adjust the pay and allowances of enlisted and commissioned personnel of the Navy. This legislation does something which that committee of which the gentleman from Idaho is chairman has nothing whatever to do. It provides that the make-up of the Annapolis Naval Academy Band shall be of a certain character—musicians, some band masters, some first-class musicians, some second-class musicians, a leader, or two leaders. The gentleman's committee has nothing on earth to do with the size or character of that band; but if this legislation is enacted into law, the gentleman's committee will later on adjust the pay for the various grades provided in this bill. There is no conflict between what we are attempting to do to-day and what the gentleman is going to do next year or 5 or 10 years from now, depending on how seriously he and his committee block that very much desired legislation.

If the gentleman's committee never meets, if it does not adjust the pay and allowances of the Navy for 5 or 10 years, then, of course, this bill does increase the salaries temporarily to a very small degree. It does so indirectly, because it provides for certain ratings, first-class musicians, certain second-class musicians, who are governed by the pay of the Navy, and the gentleman's committee may see fit at some future date to raise that pay, or it may see fit to reduce that pay; but certainly the gentleman's committee has no right to determine how many ratings there shall be in the Naval Academy Band.

I will read to you the resolution which created the gentleman's committee.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. In a moment, as soon as I have time to refresh the gentleman's memory on the resolution which created the gentleman's committee:

Be it resolved, etc., That a joint committee, to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker—

What shall they do? They shall make—

An investigation and report recommendations by bill or otherwise to their respective Houses—

On what?—

relative to the readjustment of the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the several services mentioned in the title of this joint resolution.

Nothing is said about reassigning officers and men. Nothing is said about limiting the number of officers and men—any place in the Navy. This bill might increase the number of musicians in the Naval Academy Band by 10 or 12, or it might reduce the number. That would not be in conflict with the gentleman's committee at all. That pay committee has been created for the purpose of reporting to the House its recommendations on the pay and allowances of the enlisted personnel and of the commissioned personnel.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. HALE. The resolution which the gentleman has just read, and which became law, passed the Senate, came over to the House, and was reported to the floor of the House by the Rules Committee and passed the House. I want to read the joint resolution which the Rules Committee reported in the Seventieth Congress but which did not pass, and it is this:

House Joint Resolution 430, Seventieth Congress

Resolved, etc., That a joint committee, to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Vice President, and five

Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall make an investigation and report recommendations, by bill or otherwise, to their respective Houses—

And mark this—

relative to the rank, promotion, pay, and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the several services mentioned in the title of this joint resolution.

In other words, in the Seventieth Congress an effort was made to give the joint committee jurisdiction over rank, promotion, pay, and allowances. That jurisdiction was denied, and the Congress passed a resolution in the Seventy-first Congress restricting the jurisdiction strictly to pay and allowances.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit, is not that exactly what was sought the other day in the so-called Reed resolution?

Mr. HALE. The Reed resolution, if the gentleman pleases, very carefully and very cutely endeavors to put back into the joint committee authority over the subject of promotion, which the Congress denied a year ago. And may I say further, that the Reed resolution seeks, apparently as its main object, to have a commission of representatives from the three services to make an investigation as to the subject of promotion. May I say that the gentleman from Idaho ought to know, and does know, I have no doubt, that in 1927 a committee just like the one he seeks to have appointed by the Reed resolution was appointed. The representative from the Navy, Admiral Campbell, the representative from the Marine Corps, General Fuller, and the representative from the Army, General King, investigated the whole subject and made a report, which is contained in House Naval Affairs Committee Document No. 3, December 1, 1927. The report was this:

The investigations of the board have brought forcibly to its notice the many differences among the three services in the organization, composition of personnel, character of duties, existing personnel systems, and other factors.

Differences, if you please.

These do not prevent the desired establishment of the necessary conditions above set forth. They do indicate, however, that in many respects an attempt to achieve results by identical means would defeat the end sought.

That is, would defeat the end sought by the Reed resolution.

Similar results in all the services must frequently be attained in each by different means peculiarly adapted to internal conditions. In general the most satisfactory coordination will be accomplished by each of the services working in its own way toward the common end. The recommendations herein made are predicated upon such foundation.

Mr. BRITTEN. I now yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman read the resolution creating the Joint Pay Committee and endeavors to have the House understand that the pending bill does not conflict with the duties imposed upon that joint committee.

Mr. BRITTEN. Except as I have indicated.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Did not the gentleman state a moment ago, in answer to an inquiry I made of him, that it did?

Mr. FRENCH. In response to the gentleman from Georgia a moment ago I indicated very definitely my judgment that this bill contravenes the authority placed upon the joint pay committee. The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, however, rests his insistence that it does not upon certain provisions carried in the first few lines of the bill. If he will go on further and read the bill he will find it provides for the ratings and pay of such enlisted men as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department. It provides further:

That the ratings and the proportionate distribution among the ratings of the enlisted men shall be substantially the same as in the Navy Band.

If that is not fixing the pay specifically, what would he suggest that could make it more definite? I submit that the language could hardly be clearer. The language says that the pay of these men—and most of them are of the type to which I have referred, not alone one band leader with his assistant but the most of the band—and it says that the pay shall be practically the same as that of the Navy Band. The section follows on with these words:

That the leader, second leader, and the enlisted men of the Naval Academy Band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are or hereafter may become applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Navy.

In other words, granting—which I do not grant at all—that the first two illustrations used by the gentlemen might be subject matter within the jurisdiction of his committee, nine-tenths of the matter involved here is on the subject matter that has to do with the problem that you have charged the joint committee with the responsibility of considering.

Mr. BRITTEN. May I ask the gentleman a question before he sits down? Will not the joint committee give consideration to the future pay and allowances of the men affected by this bill?

Mr. FRENCH. The committee is endeavoring to give consideration to every phase of the problem.

Mr. BRITTEN. So that the pay of these men finally devolves upon the gentleman's committee. There is no question about that, is there?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, no. The pay that will be fixed will depend upon the action the Congress may take. Your Joint Pay Committee has been charged with the responsibility of reporting either legislation or making a report to the Congress, and by the introduction of this bill you are seeking, two months after the committee has been appointed and authorized, to come in and, by piecemeal, take charge of and pass upon a part of the very work you have charged this committee with the responsibility of considering.

Mr. BRITTEN. In part, I agree with the gentleman. So far as the fixing of pay is concerned, his committee has jurisdiction. I will go even further than that and say that, although we have reported this bill within two months after the committee was arranged for by the resolution just read, my personal impression is that two years from now we could still report this bill without having had any action from him or his committee. That is my impression of the activity of the committee.

Let me go a little further. Let me suggest to the House how really important this bill is that these gentlemen are making such a great fuss about. The legislation does provide for certain ratings, certain bandmasters and certain first and second class musicians. Let me tell the House what their pay is. There are 20 musicians, first class, base pay \$72 a month. Think of it! That may be too much money, in the estimation of the gentleman from Idaho, to pay a man who probably has a wife and four or five children living at Annapolis. Twenty-three first musicians, base pay \$84 a month. It is jarring to some Members of this House to think of raising these salaries. It is terrible to think that we are now contemplating this very serious legislation that raises the salary of a man with, perhaps, a family, from \$72 a month or \$84 a month. In these two ratings there are 43 men. Then we have 20 bandmasters with a base pay of \$99 a month.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman answer a question there?

Mr. BRITTEN. Certainly.

Mr. DOWELL. What do they actually receive?

Mr. BRITTEN. It depends upon their length of service; but suppose they get twice \$72 or twice \$84, after 10 or 12 years of service, no gentleman on the floor of the House should say that is too much. Most of these men are married and have families, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. There is not any question about the amount—

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, no. I know how the gentleman feels about that.

Mr. DOWELL. I am simply asking the question for information.

Mr. BRITTEN. I realize that. The report I have before me does not disclose those facts, because the ratings and the musicians themselves change places from time to time. A man may be in the Naval Academy Band to-day and next year he may not be in the service at all, and some new man may come in and be a first-class musician or a musician of the second class with a different rating. His pay and allowances, of course, are based first on his base pay, which may be \$72 or \$84 or \$99 a month. Then in addition to that in each pay period he gets an increased amount.

Mr. DOWELL. Of course, everyone knows they can not live on the base pay.

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; but they start on the base pay.

Mr. DOWELL. And I was trying to find out how much the total amount would be.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say to the gentleman that I do not know what they get, and if we had a report that was made several months ago it would perhaps not be accurate to-day.

Mr. BOWMAN. How does it compare with the other bands?

Mr. BRITTEN. They get less.

Mr. GAMBRILL. If the gentleman will yield, I think I can answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAMBRILL. If we consider this subject from the basis of the pay of the Naval Academy Band, I will say there are 45 musicians of the first class, who receive a base pay at the present time of \$84 a month, and they have 27 musicians, second class, who receive a base pay of \$60 a month. If they are put upon the same status as the Navy Band here in Washington, there will be 11 musicians who will receive a base pay of \$126 per month, 20 musicians who will receive a base pay of \$99 per month, 23 first musicians who will receive a base pay of \$84 a month, and 20 musicians who will receive a base pay of \$72 a month.

Mr. PATTERSON. That does not answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa at all.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman wants to know what they get for service.

Mr. GAMBRILL. I think my statement answers the question of the gentleman.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I ask unanimous consent that the time at my disposal be transferred to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill, in the first place, does not change—raise or lower—the pay of any rating or grade at present established. They all remain exactly as they are in the existing law until such time as the joint committee shall report to this Congress and this Congress shall pass some modification or change of that pay.

This bill merely provides how many men of each grade or rating, in accordance with the present established pay scale, shall be the component parts of this Naval Academy Band.

Second, with regard to the question of the individual's pay, each man, when he joins that band, joins it in a given rating and gets for his first five years the base pay of that grade or rating. After 20 years of continuous service his base pay will be increased by approximately 40 per cent—I think, exactly 40 per cent—but that does not come until the fourth pay period. This bill does not seek and does not actually change the pay of any rating anywhere in the service.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COYLE. Gladly.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, a musician who has served five years at \$60 a month would get about \$6 a month more.

Mr. COYLE. Yes. He gets an increase of 10 per cent at the end of five years.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I regret exceedingly to see the distinguished gentleman from Idaho, whom I generally follow, and who has saved hundreds of millions of dollars to the Treasury, waste his time to-day on a \$3-a-week increase for the musicians at Annapolis. It is beneath him. I am glad to follow the gentleman from Idaho in opposition to some other bills, but this has nothing to do with the functions of his committee or of the joint commission of which he is a member.

Why, gentlemen, do you want to maintain a band at Annapolis or do you not? You must understand that the band at Annapolis is just as necessary a part of the personnel as the faculty and the officers detailed there. The Annapolis Band must so far as possible be split up into three bands. There are three battalions of cadets, and every afternoon or morning the battalions drill separately, and the band is split into three bands.

Besides each musician must be able to double in strings and brass. That means he must be able to play in the band and also play in the orchestra.

The only way to get musicians is to go out and enlist them from the profession; you can not transfer a sailor from the boiler room or the deck to the band, you can not transfer a man from the radio room and put him in the band. We need professional men. Take the market for musicians. You can not get a good musician to live in Annapolis on \$60 a month.

Mr. PATTERSON. Do they not get anything in addition to that?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Suppose they get quarters allowance; what are you going to do? Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama—

Mr. STAFFORD. Where does the gentleman get his \$60?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. On page 4 of the report it says \$60 a month, but suppose he gets \$84 a month.

Mr. STAFFORD. On page 3, the compensation is stated.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I am talking about the present pay at Annapolis; that is what we are trying to bring them up to. The gentleman is reading from page 3, the pay of the Navy Band.

Now, take for instance \$84 basic pay, \$21 a week. Suppose the musician does have quarters allowance. Do you think that he could support a family on \$21 a week? Is that proper pay to give a professional man working for the United States Government? Why, if he plays in an orchestra in Washington he gets a salary of \$80 a week. Why, the porters who do the cleaning up around the Capitol get more than that.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is beyond the question—there are two phases to this matter, one pointed out by the gentleman from Idaho. The gentleman from Idaho has not gotten in wrong many times in this House.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. He is wrong this time.

Mr. PATTERSON. How many of these men have families?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. They nearly all have families, and they must be good musicians.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think it would be fair to say that 60 or 70 per cent of these men are married.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly. The younger men come in and enlist in the lower grade and after learning the profession go out and in order to keep the men in you have to give a living wage. The gentleman from Alabama has stood consistently for giving a living wage. You have a Navy Band, and you have an Annapolis Band, and all this bill seeks to do is to bring the band at Annapolis up to the level of the other band in the same service.

Otherwise you will never be able to get any musicians for the Annapolis Band, and that band is necessary to the work of the academy. As I said before, they split it into three, one with each battalion. Further, they furnish all the orchestra music for the academy. I appeal to the gentleman from Idaho to drop this picayune matter and favor this bill and get on to some of the big things that are coming on this afternoon.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I am very much interested in the statement of my good friend from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], with whom I have voted on almost every question affecting the workingmen in this country, but I think he is trying to bring forth in this case a question that is not the real issue.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It is to these poor women who are trying to buy shoes for the kids. It may be a matter of principle to Members of Congress, but it is not to them.

Mr. PATTERSON. I decline to yield further. Of course, I am not a pacifist, and I do not rise in the spirit of a pacifist. I believe in fighting at the proper time, but I say now that if we follow some gentlemen on the floor of this House in regard to the Navy, we will be spending \$750,000,000 a year to carry on the Navy, and no one will deny that—not even the gentleman from New York. There is a fundamental question involved here. We have appointed a committee to study the whole rate and pay schedule of the Army and Navy and bring in a report. When this report is brought in, then it will be time enough for the smiling and genial gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] to come forward with some bill to rectify any discrimination that he might think would follow.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to ask the gentleman a question myself. What has become of the conference the gentleman proposed to carry on between the House of Commons in England and Congress in the United States—I believe it was to arrange a reduction in naval armament? And now, whenever the President of the United States, who is sincerely trying to reduce the Navy expense and maintain parity in cooperation with other gentlemen, like the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], brings forth a suggestion, the gentleman comes in with a proposition and says that any reduction of armament means to build up to the limit of that agreement and does not mean to build as low as conditions for safety and national security will permit.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman think the United States Government ought to live up to an agreement it might make with the British Government?

Mr. PATTERSON. Absolutely.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is all that I am in favor of.

Mr. PATTERSON. We are getting beside the issue here, but we seem to have plenty of time to discuss this question. Does the gentleman feel that any agreement we may have to limit armaments—I want to put the gentleman on record—not to build beyond a certain point, means that it is mandatory to build to the limit?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; it is not mandatory at all.

Mr. PATTERSON. That answers my question.

Mr. BRITTEN. Let me ask the gentleman a question about this bill.

Mr. PATTERSON. All right.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is the gentleman convinced from the arguments that he has heard up to the present moment, that Mr. FRENCH's committee is authorized to establish or rearrange classifications in the various branches of the Navy?

Mr. PATTERSON. No; I am not convinced of that, but I am convinced that they are studying this pay and rate question, and we should not bring in a number of these little bills as have been brought in from time to time—we had one or two on the Consent Calendar the other day—to raise the pay of different people. The gentleman admits that this is an indirect pay raise. What else is it? It is brought in before this study is completed.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will not say that it is an indirect pay raise.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman did say so on the floor of the House.

Mr. BRITTEN. I did; but I will tell the gentleman what I intended to say. I intended this, that it does take more money out of the Treasury than is now taken out of the Treasury for pay of the Navy by eleven or twelve or thirteen thousand dollars a year.

Mr. COLLINS. The gentleman knows that this is a pay increase.

Mr. PATTERSON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] makes the point that that is all there is to it.

Mr. BRITTEN. Let me make this clear in the gentleman's mind. This does provide for certain additional rating in the Navy Band, and then, if certain men ultimately get those ratings those ratings are a little higher than the present ratings, and in that way if a musician in the band to-day remains in the band and gets this new rating from the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, his pay is raised, but no rate is raised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not think the gentleman is enlightening the House along that line. We all understand that it is a scheme to raise these men now, and then whenever they get along with the study and they are recognized in a certain grade they will be raised more, and then if there are any little raises left off and the gentleman from Illinois thinks they ought not to have been left off, he will bring in another bill to accomplish that.

Mr. BRITTEN. In a case as worthy as this one you may be sure that the gentleman from Illinois will bring in such a bill.

Mr. COLLINS. The report of the committee brought to the House says that if this bill becomes a law the pay of the Naval Academy Band will be substantially the same as the Navy Band.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to get a little farther along with my statement.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. Has the gentleman considered the psychological effect of music upon the human mind?

Mr. PATTERSON. We are not going into a discussion of music. I am a great one to listen to it myself.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does the gentleman think that music is essential in carrying out the objects of the academy?

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, I like to get out in the morning and hear the birds sing, but I decline to yield further.

Mr. BOYLAN. Just this further question.

Mr. PATTERSON. All right.

Mr. BOYLAN. Does the gentleman not think it would be exceedingly difficult for a man to get up the proper amount of steam and wind, so as to be properly compensated, and that he would not be able to do it, to play these horns on \$15 a week?

Mr. PATTERSON. This has nothing to do with music. This is a fundamental question of raising pay by indirection. Gentlemen have brought out the smallness of the pay, but when you take into consideration the allowances it is not so bad. Take the millions of people out of employment and others who are living on a less wage per week now. Many women are trying to maintain their families on less wages than are being given to these men now.

I tell you that when you take into consideration all these things, I am going to be one Member of this House who will vote against such increases as carried in this bill at this time.

The gentleman from Illinois attempted to make the point several times that he was afraid this study would not be made. I think it will be made in plenty of time to increase the pay of the Navy by several million dollars. If it were not in the hands of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], God only knows where the increase would go, and he has not revealed it to us at this time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I notice in this bill that it is provided that the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader with the pay and allowances of a lieutenant, senior grade, United States Navy, and one second leader with the pay and allowances of a warrant officer. What becomes of the rest of the members of the band? Do they get their salaries increased?

Mr. PATTERSON. They will all have an increase, but, of course, it increases these higher grades more, just as when they get their 40 per cent raise. If it were not for the fact that the joint committee has on it such men as the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], these higher grades would get the bulk of the increase, I fear.

Mr. PALMER. Are they not already getting an adequate amount?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes; compared with what the farmers throughout the country are getting.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You can not compare farmers with the members of a band.

Mr. PATTERSON. You can do that just as well as you can get a band to go down there and play out food and clothes for the children of the poor and unemployed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, in the early part of last winter the Senate passed, and the House passed at the earnest solicitation of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a resolution appointing a joint pay committee. The members of the committee on the part of the House appointed by the Speaker were the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. This committee, together with a committee of similar type appointed from the Senate under the same resolution, has been diligently at work every moment of time that could be devoted to that work, gathering together the necessary information that would enable them to make an intelligent report to the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. And that is in direct contravention of the insinuation that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] is making to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], that it would be after a 10-year postponement.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Idaho did not make that statement. Everybody who knows the gentleman from Idaho knows that he takes his responsibilities in this House as seriously as any Member of the House. [Applause.] Everyone who knows him and has seen his work here in behalf of fair play for the employees of the Navy Department, for the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and also of the Army, for the things that they need, giving them what they need and what is fair, knows that he will meet that responsibility face to face and will not shirk it. We know that he will be faithful in his work, and his past record is a pledge to you that that will be done. Now, is it a fair thing for the membership of this House, facing that situation, to pass legislation which involves that problem rather than clarifies it?

How good is this legislation? I do not know anything about the merits of this band, but I will read you one sentence of a letter from the Secretary of the Navy:

The bill H. R. 514 was referred to the Bureau of the Budget with the above information. Under date of July 19, 1929, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised the Navy Department that the expenditures contemplated by this proposed legislation would not be in accord with the financial program of the President.

Now, farther on, in another letter, there is suggested the exact language that is in this bill, together with another bill, H. R. 4896, almost on the same line; and in that second letter, under date of January 11, 1930, this appears:

Under date of December 19, 1929, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised the Navy Department that the expenditure contemplated by this proposed legislation would not be in accord with the financial program of the President.

Now, is it good faith, when a committee is earnestly and honestly at work trying to solve this problem for this House, to go to work and pass this bill?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting words of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for making that motion has not yet arrived. It is in order to make it after the first section of the bill is read. If there is no further debate, the bill will be read for amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Naval Academy Band shall hereafter consist of one leader with the pay and allowances of a lieutenant, senior grade, United States Navy; one second leader with the pay and allowances of a warrant officer; and of such enlisted men and in such ratings as may be assigned to that band by the Navy Department: *Provided*, That the ratings and the proportionate distribution among the ratings of the enlisted men shall be substantially the same as in the Navy Band: *Provided further*, That the leader, assistant leader, and the enlisted men of the Naval Academy Band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are or hereafter may become applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Navy.

With a committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "assistant" and insert in lieu thereof the word "second."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a perfecting amendment in order to accommodate the desires of the gentleman from Idaho. I want to change the first line of the title and make it read, "Adjusting the grades and ratings."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the title can be amended after the bill has been passed by the House.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho moves to strike out the enacting words. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I call for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 20, noes 52.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON] having resumed the chair, Mr. HOOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10380) adjusting the salaries of the Naval Academy Band, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the title of the bill be amended by striking out the word "salaries," so that the title will read: "Adjusting the grades and ratings of the Naval Academy Band."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRITTEN: Amend the title so that it will read: "A bill adjusting the grades and ratings of the Naval Academy Band."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COMMISSIONERS, COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7822) amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 964, ch. 301), entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court

of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation," and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and accompanying statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7822) amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stats. p. 964, ch. 301), entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 2 and the amendment to the title of the bill.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

GEORGE S. GRAHAM,

L. C. DYER,

A. J. MONTAGUE,

Managers on the part of the House.

CHARLES S. DENEEN,

F. H. GILLET,

H. D. STEPHENS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7822) amending section 2 and repealing section 3 of the act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stats. 964, ch. 301), entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioners by the Court of Claims and to prescribe their powers and compensation, and for other purposes," submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the conference report, namely, the amendment No. 1 of the Senate to which the conferees have agreed merely changes the description of the act amended by the bill. It is purely formal and in no way alters the substance of the House provision. It is briefer than the description embodied in the first section as the House passed the bill and in its effect it is identical and amounts merely to a choice of language.

The Senate recedes from its amendment No. 2 to the bill and the conferees have restored the House provision. The only substantial change sought to be made by the Senate by its amendment was to limit the life of the act until January 11, 1934. No such limitation was contained in the House bill and by the action of the conferees they have restored the provision of the House bill.

With Senate amendment No. 2 eliminated from the bill there is no necessity to amend the title.

GEORGE S. GRAHAM,

L. C. DYER,

A. J. MONTAGUE,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state what the effect of the respective recessions is?

Mr. GRAHAM. The effect of the conference report is that the House recedes and concurs in the Senate's amendment as to the first clause. That only relates to a description of the title of the legislation, and effects no change whatever in the bill, but is merely a matter of taste in the selection of words to express the thought.

Section 2 is vital, and the Senate recedes from their amendment, and the House provisions are adopted. The only point in that is that the commissioners heretofore had to be reappointed every three years. The House struck out that limitation, and they will now remain in office until the House revokes their appointment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 10166) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10166) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to construct hospital buildings, and to provide equipment, accessories, utilities, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, on land already acquired or hereby authorized to be acquired therefor by purchase, gift, or otherwise, at or in the vicinity of the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., subject to appropriation hereafter made; the land, if purchased, to cost not in excess of \$200,000; and the buildings, equipment, accessories, utilities, and appurtenances to cost not in excess of \$3,000,000.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrances and without cost to the United States, the title in fee simple to such lands as he may deem necessary or desirable for said purpose.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW].

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee who has opposed this legislation, will I be entitled to control the time in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that those opposed to the measure are entitled to one hour, and as a minority member the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma in control of one hour.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DARROW].

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, H. R. 10166, is to authorize the construction of a new naval hospital in Philadelphia to replace the temporary wood construction, stuccoed buildings built during the war period in 1917, 1918, and 1919, which are now in a very dilapidated condition, and are a serious fire hazard. The original cost of the present buildings was \$888,000, and in the past five and a half years \$243,000 has been spent in maintenance, upkeep, and repairs, and it can safely be estimated that such expense will steadily increase. There can, therefore, be no question of the urgent need for their replacement by a modern fireproof building. This fact is readily admitted by the Secretary of the Navy, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, the Commandant of the Philadelphia Navy Yard, and all officers of the department who are familiar with existing conditions at the hospital. I have before me photographs of these buildings, which will readily demonstrate the vast extent of their deterioration and establish the unsafe condition under which our sick and disabled veterans and Navy personnel are housed. I wish to emphasize the assertion that the best care and attention that can be given our sick and disabled veterans and personnel is none too good, and venture the opinion that such is the sentiment of Congress.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand that if this hospital is rebuilt it will be open to veterans as well as to men in the Navy?

Mr. DARROW. It will, of course. I shall come to that in just a minute. The falling away of the sills and the temporary woodwork pulls the plumbing and heating pipes apart, and this makes a dangerous and unsafe condition. While this hospital is primarily a naval hospital, manned and controlled by officers and personnel of the Navy, its facilities are being used by the Veterans' Bureau for their patients. Testimony presented to the Naval Affairs Committee establishes the fact that this dual service renders a considerable saving to the Federal Treasury—in fact, approximately \$118,000 during the last year—when the lower cost of caring for general hospital cases of the Veterans' Bureau is compared with the sum it would have cost for the treatment of the same number of cases at a bureau hospital. This, of course, is due to the reduced overhead charges and the lower cost at which such service can be rendered by naval personnel. Further, the testimony of Doctor Skinner, Chief of the Regional Office Medical Service of the Veterans' Bureau, shows that the bureau has been depending on other facilities than their own for the treatment of their patients. He states that they now have about 2,000 patients in Army hospitals and about 2,800 in naval hospitals, and to a large extent they have been depending upon these facilities in the eastern part of the country for general hospital cases.

Asked as to how many beds the bureau needed for their patients in Philadelphia, Doctor Skinner stated approximately 450—that is, they could use 450—that they had enough on the waiting list to use that many. It was further estimated that this demand would increase, and that as the age of veterans increases there will be a greater demand for beds.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think there is any argument against the necessity of a new naval hospital for the East, but there seems to be considerable objection to the proposed site. Would the gentleman be willing to so amend section 2 as to make it only discretionary? In other words, provide for your hospital, and leave the matter of the site to the selection of the Secretary and not make section 2 mandatory. I would like to make section 2 as broad as I can, so that the intent of Congress will be that if the Secretary accepts this particular site he will do so on his own responsibility and not on our direction.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I understand there are probably three sites in view. One is in the Philadelphia Navy Yard, one is on a Government-owned piece of property out in the city, and then it is contemplated to purchase one for which an authorization of \$200,000 is made. I agree with the gentleman from New York that there should be broad discretion given to the department to determine which of those places will be used. The department may determine not to buy any property but to put the hospital where the hospital is now located in the navy yard, or it may determine to destroy the building that is used there now and put it on Government-owned property. I think the gentleman has raised a very important question, and I believe broad latitude should be given for the acquisition of any land, whether by purchase or by the use of land which the Government already owns.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly. In other words, section 2 might be construed as a direction to the Secretary to accept this offer. After we have authorized and appropriated our legislative function is finished, and it is up to the Secretary to find a proper location for his hospital. My only objection to this bill when it was on the Consent Calendar was that I learned there was objection on the part of officials of the Navy Department with reference to a certain location. That is their responsibility, and I suggest that section 2 be so amended as to make it clear that the choice should rest with the Secretary and that the responsibility is to be his.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not section 2 confer that discretionary authority on the Secretary of the Navy? It was our intention to do that, and I think the verbiage is broad enough to do the very thing the gentleman is speaking about.

Mr. HALE. If the gentleman will permit, I think there is discretion both in section 1 and section 2, a discretion in section 1 when it comes to the matter of a purchase and discretion in section 2 when it comes to the acceptance of a gift.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Section 1 provides for the location of the hospital "at or in the vicinity of the navy yard."

Mr. HALE. I assume the words "at or in the vicinity of the navy yard" would cover the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. During general debate let us get together on that.

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, and if he has some language which will improve it I will be in favor of it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That was my only point.

Mr. HALE. It seemed to me the bill covered it.

Mr. DARROW. I may say that so far as I am concerned, I want to put the discretion as to the selection of the site in the hands of the Secretary, because we certainly want to get the best available site. The city of Philadelphia has offered to give the Navy Department or the Government a tract of land adjoining the navy yard of 12.7 acres.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Without any cost?

Mr. DARROW. Without any cost whatever; and the general opinion is that this is as desirable a site as can be found anywhere in this locality. The object of putting in the \$200,000 provision was not to tie it definitely but to give sufficient latitude so that if a better proposition can be found, the Secretary of the Navy will have authority to accept such a site or the site that is now offered by the city, whichever, in his judgment, is best.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman please inform me if an authorization by Congress is necessary for the Army or the Navy to accept as a gift land for a building of this kind?

Mr. DARROW. Yes; I think that is absolutely essential.

Mr. DUNBAR. I want to speak on that subject a few minutes. May I have the time now? Will the gentleman yield for that purpose now? Of course, I can get time when the bill is read.

Mr. DARROW. I am sure the gentleman can have time in general debate on the bill if he wants it.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the gentleman will permit, may I state my proposed amendment so he may have it in mind? My suggestion would be that if we simply strike out, on page 1, the words "of the navy yard" so it will read "to be acquired therefor by purchase, gift, or otherwise, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa." this, together with the debate that will clearly show the intent of Congress, will give sufficient latitude so that they may select the best site available.

Mr. DARROW. In his annual report for 1929, the Secretary of the Navy, under the heading, "New Hospital Construction," makes the following statement:

The most urgent need of construction exists at Philadelphia. There the hospital buildings are all of the temporary type. They are rapidly deteriorating and can not be used much longer. A tract of land has been offered as a gift by the city of Philadelphia. This offer makes available for hospital construction a tract of 28 acres favorably situated because of its proximity to the navy yard.

Based on my knowledge of the need of a new naval hospital from personal investigation and observation of conditions, and conferences with Admiral Latimer, commandant of the navy yard, several years ago in cooperation with Admiral Latimer efforts were made to induce our city authorities to donate to the Government a site on which a modern hospital could be erected. Quite a number of conferences were had with our mayor, members of city council and our park commission, and others, and as a result the city has agreed to donate a site of 12.7 acres adjoining the navy yard on the north, which in conjunction with a plot of 15.4 acres available in the navy yard would afford a sufficiently large site. In my judgment, and in the opinion of many others competent to pass on this subject, this site will fully meet the needs of this contemplated hospital construction. However, the final selection of a site is proposed to be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, and in order that there may be an opportunity to acquire another site if one can be had which is more desirable, and it should be found advisable to secure it by purchase, this bill authorizes an appropriation of not exceeding \$200,000. In any event this question will be finally determined before an estimate is submitted to Congress for an appropriation.

Early this year, after further conferences with officers of the Navy Department, and earnest appeals by the American Legion and other service organizations that something be done immediately to relieve the distressing conditions of these hospital buildings, I introduced this bill providing for the construction of a new building in replacement. Naturally I had every reason to believe this was in full approval of the expressed wish of the Navy Department, particularly in view of the recommendation previously made by the Secretary of the Navy in his annual report. Imagine, therefore, the surprise the Committee on Naval Affairs received in the report of the Acting Secretary of the Navy, under date of March 18, 1930. After acknowledging the receipt of the committee's request for a report on my bill, H. R. 10166, and stating its purpose, the Acting Secretary stated:

The Navy Department has had for consideration the advisability of constructing a new naval hospital at or near the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., for some years. This matter was referred to the board for the development of navy-yard plans, which is a board of 14 members composed of representatives of the navy-yard division of the office of the Secretary of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, all bureaus of the Navy Department, and the headquarters of the United States Marine Corps. The precept of the board sets forth its duties as follows:

"The board shall prepare for each of the bases listed in the shore establishment project (of the Navy) a comprehensive plan of development embodying the requirements of the shore establishment project and the essential features of an ideal layout so far as may be practicable for the base under consideration. In preparing such plans due consideration shall be given to existing facilities and present arrangement so that the complete project may be attained with a minimum expenditure."

It will be seen from the above that the duties of this board are to coordinate the needs of the shore establishment of the Navy so far as new construction is concerned. The most recent report of the board to the Secretary of the Navy in regard to new construction carries a new

naval hospital at Philadelphia. Inasmuch as other items on the list are deemed more necessary to the efficiency of the naval service, and have not been provided for, this item was not included in the list of projects provided for in the bill, H. R. 1192, which has been favorably reported to the House, and therefore the Navy Department does not recommend that the bill H. R. 10166 be enacted at the present time.

May I briefly refer to several points covered by this adverse report on our hospital bill?

First. It will be noted that the Navy Department has had under consideration for some years the advisability of constructing a new naval hospital at Philadelphia.

Second. The fact that this matter has been under consideration by the board for the development of navy-yard plans. In this connection, permit me to refer to the testimony of Admiral McNamee, a member of this board, wherein he admitted the urgent necessity of erecting a new naval hospital in Philadelphia, and added:

While this hospital was considered from a point of view of a hospital as very urgent, there were many other things the Navy needed in order to keep going that used up all the appropriations. That is the reason it has never been actually presented to Congress here.

Third. The statement is made that inasmuch as provision had not yet been made for the items included in H. R. 1192—known as the shore construction bill—the department does not recommend the enactment of the bill H. R. 10166 at the present time. Since this statement was made the shore bill has been enacted into law, and that objection, of course, is now removed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to consume any unnecessary time. I feel it is perfectly clear that this hospital is for the benefit of the veterans as well as the Navy personnel.

At the last report there were 629 patients here, and of this number 187 were Navy patients, 448 were general and surgical patients from the Veterans' Bureau, and 34 supernumeraries, which, as I understand, refers to those of the Spanish War period.

It is, as I said before, a decided economy to use this hospital in this dual capacity. The testimony before the committee was that during the past year, with a minimum number, there was an actual saving of \$118,000, due to the overhead having a greater spread and to the employment and use of medical officers and nurses of the Navy.

I am confident also that our veteran patients would much prefer to go to this hospital than to any hospital available under the Veterans' Bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five more minutes.

Mr. DARROW. Unless there are some further questions—

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. GOLDER. The construction of this hospital will permit, will it not, the removal of veterans from the hospital at Grays Ferry Road?

Mr. DARROW. No; the hospital at Grays Ferry Road, known as No. 49, takes care of neuropsychiatric cases only. Those at the naval hospital in Philadelphia are general hospital cases and surgical cases, many of them emergency cases. Some of the neuropsychiatric or mental cases at Hospital No. 49, when the Coatesville Hospital is completed, will be moved there. No. 49 hospital is a very old building, over 73 or 75 years old, and is not adapted for hospital purposes at all.

Mr. GOLDER. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. DARROW. It is in what was formerly a naval home, but during the expansion it has been used for this purpose.

Mr. LEECH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. LEECH. In connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOLDER] Hospital No. 49 has about 400 neuropsychiatric patients.

Mr. DARROW. Yes.

Mr. LEECH. The hospital at Coatesville, when completed, will only furnish facilities for 250.

Mr. DARROW. That is right.

Mr. LEECH. Then did I understand the gentleman to intend to convey the idea that the Coatesville hospital will be sufficiently large, as now provided for, to take care of all the patients in Hospital No. 49?

Mr. DARROW. No; they will still have to use that hospital until other and additional hospital facilities are obtained. The Veterans' Bureau say they have 460 cases for general hospitalization in this particular section.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am very much interested in the statement the distinguished gentleman is making, and I would like to ask this question, which I do not believe has been brought out: How many patients will this contemplated hospital provide for?

Mr. DARROW. This provides for 600 patients with facilities for expansion to 800. There is a certain space allowed for each bed, 8 feet on the center, but by a little closer arrangement they can accommodate 800 cases in case of necessity.

Mr. PATTERSON. What about the statement that is being made that there are a good many vacant beds in the naval hospital here? I have not made any investigation along that line. Does the gentleman think there is no other way to meet this demand? I know the gentleman has studied this question, and I would like to hear him on that.

Mr. DARROW. In answer to the gentleman, may I say that all the testimony we have been able to obtain makes us feel that the necessity will increase rapidly as time goes on, and that it will probably be some time in 1944 before the peak is reached.

During the last year the demand has been increasing, and there is now, I understand, a waiting list.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will allow me, there are a considerable number of navy hospital beds vacant to-day, but they are not in this area. This area is overcrowded. The buildings are overcrowded. This is not an expansion program, it is a replacement program.

Mr. DARROW. The last report shows that there are 629 patients there, and the normal capacity of the hospital is only 600.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARROW. I yield.

Mr. PALMER. Is it not a fact that this hospital is equipped with modern equipment, considered one of the best, and is indorsed by the Legion?

Mr. DARROW. Yes; but the buildings are not modern.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, if this bill is a patronage measure, it ought not to be enacted into law. If it is one that shows necessity for additional hospitalization for naval patients, it ought to be passed by this body. What I intend to do is not to talk of generalities but to quote figures and facts, and then you gentlemen do as you please when it comes to voting on the bill on its final passage.

In the first place, when the veterans' program has been completed they will have approximately 6,000 vacant beds. Now, get me right; I say when completed, with the money already authorized.

And likewise there will be 4,000 vacant beds in the naval hospitals. That is more than 10,000 vacant beds available to be used for veteran patients and naval patients.

I would be the last person on earth to oppose any measure that was necessary to hospitalize patients in any branch of the Government service, but it does seem to me that this House should take into consideration the facts, and if there is a condition that needs to be remedied it ought to pass this bill, and I would be the last to oppose it, otherwise this bill should not be passed.

What is the proposition before the House at the present time? It is not to build a veterans' hospital but to build a naval hospital. For what? To take care of veteran patients. This bill is not approved by any branch of our Government. It is not approved by the Secretary of the Navy; it is not approved by the Budget; and General Hines, of the Veterans' Bureau, has written a letter to the Rules Committee in which he stated he could not approve of the measure. If anybody wants to dispute the accuracy of that statement, I have the letter available and will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. DARROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DARROW. Does the gentleman say that General Hines does not approve of it or that he does not request it?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. He does not approve of this legislation. That section of the letter will be read before I conclude. Another Member of Congress has that communication and I will be glad to bring it to the attention of the House.

I want to say that I have no desire to deceive anybody, I simply want to bring the facts before the House, and then if you want to pass the bill you can do so.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. GOLDER. Do I understand the gentleman to claim that the Secretary of the Navy did not approve of this construction?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. He does not approve of the bill.

Mr. GOLDER. Let me read from page 1 of the report:

The Secretary of the Navy in his annual report for 1929, under the heading "New Hospital Construction," makes the following statement: "The most urgent need of construction exists at Philadelphia. There the hospital buildings are all of the temporary type. They are rapidly deteriorating and can not be used much longer. A tract of land has been offered as a gift by the city of Philadelphia. This offer makes available for hospital construction a tract of 28 acres favorably situated because of its proximity to the navy yard."

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. On page 4, the last two lines, reads, as follows:

And therefore the Navy Department does not recommend that the bill H. R. 10166 be enacted at the present time.

Mr. GOLDER. But he does not question the necessity.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The Secretary of the Navy is in charge of naval activities. He should become conversant with every need of the Navy and then be the only spokesman when it comes to approving and disapproving legislation. I hope some time we will have a Secretary of the Navy who will be possessed of sufficient intestinal fortitude to run it and close the mouths of these minor officials who try to write reports on legislation. That is his duty, and his function, and he ought to recognize it. He has done it in this particular instance.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DARROW. The gentleman refers to what the Secretary of the Navy says—that he does not recommend it. The reason given for it was because the items in H. R. 1192 had not been enacted into law. When he made that statement that was true, but since then that bill, which we know as the omnibus bill, has been passed. Does not that remove the objection that the gentleman raises?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I regret exceedingly that I can not be in accord with him on a bill that I consider to be more sectional patronage than to take care of the actual needs of the Navy. Why do I say that? In the Navy at the present time we have more than 1,200 vacant beds, in addition to about 3,000 beds that are being utilized by the veterans' patients. That information is to be found in the records, and I will give you the page on which is a statement from the Veterans' Bureau.

On page 964 of the hearings they say that it will be the policy of the Veterans' Bureau to withdraw veteran patients from naval hospitals when they have sufficient facilities to take care of them. If that is true, and they have now before them appropriations amounting to \$15,000,000, which they claim will provide 3,900 beds, that number will represent the number of patients to be withdrawn.

Mr. DARROW. For what purpose are those beds to be available?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. When those beds are made available they will withdraw that many naval patients and put them in the Veterans' Bureau, as they should do, and when they do that it will mean that we will have over 4,000 vacant beds in the naval hospitals with nobody to put in them. Nobody can dispute the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. BRITTEN. Oh, yes; there are several Members who want to dispute it.

Mr. DARROW. Oh, yes.

Mr. HALE. Certainly I want to dispute it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is according to the figures that I have here.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have before me all of the figures furnished me by the Veterans' Bureau, which relate to hospitalization, and they show that on February 1, 1930, they had more than 2,000 vacant beds in the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am going to be fair about this. These vacancies are probably scattered throughout the United States, and it may be true that in some States where there are veteran hospitals they are all filled to capacity, but that does not mean that we do not have sufficient beds to take care of the needs of the Veterans' Bureau. It does mean, probably, that we would have to put them on a train and move them from one place to another. I ask unanimous consent at this point to insert this statement as a part of my remarks in order that the House may know that I am speaking from facts and not from hearsay.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Statement showing bed capacity, patient load, and capital investment (exclusive of real estate where such division is possible) of United States Veterans' Hospitals in part

Location	Bed capacity Feb. 1, 1930	Average patient load January, 1930	Capital investment to June 30, 1929, exclusive of land	Remarks
Palo Alto, Calif. ¹	1,010	927	\$3,214,520.04	
Alexandria, La. ¹	419	338	1,434,753.75	
Washington, D. C. ¹	235	179	1,459,461.54	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Waukesha, Wis. ¹	250	200	506,933.00	Do.
Perry Point, Md. ^{1,2}	1,058	1,012	1,862,098.29	Property acquired from War Department. ³
Atlanta, Ga. ¹	85		276,706.13	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings; temporarily closed to permit of enlargement.
Philadelphia, Pa. ⁴	416	437		Owned by Navy Department; original cost of buildings unknown.
Whipple, Ariz. ⁵	600	492	831,142.00	Property owned by War Department. ³
Tucson, Ariz. ¹	261	254	1,418,376.81	Constructed from ground up.
Boise, Idaho. ¹	235	163	105,672.50	Property owned by War Department. ³
Dwight, Ill. ¹	225	198	315,388.92	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Fort Bayard, N. Mex. ¹	450	362	1,189,452.00	Property acquired from War Department. ³
Knoxville, Iowa. ¹	585	583	1,407,696.75	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Oteen, N. C. ^{1,2}	742	582	1,322,957.58	Property acquired from War Department. ³
Augusta, Ga. ¹	617	610	1,962,541.80	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Lake City, Fla. ^{4,6}	300	275	687,928.75	Do.
Fort Harrison, Mont. ¹	304	255	169,699.78	Property owned by War Department. ³
Gulfport, Miss. ^{1,2}	425	416	1,132,587.74	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Hines, Ill. ¹	1,007	930	3,541,115.13	Hospital purchased while in process of construction; price included both land and buildings.
Portland, Oreg. ¹	313	299	1,304,472.53	Constructed from ground up.
Ark Little Rock, Ark. ²	750	708	1,371,064.10	Property acquired from War Department. ³
Outwood, Ky. ¹	375	342	2,685,878.85	Constructed from ground up.
Fort Lyon, Colo. ¹	500	361	19,650.00	Property acquired from Navy Department. ³
Bronx, N. Y. ¹	900	960	3,623,134.04	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Walla Walla, Wash. ⁴	355	209	814,716.73	Property acquired from War Department. ³
Sheridan, Wyo. ⁴	438	444	543,187.00	Do. ¹
Memphis, Tenn. ¹	360	333	1,133,773.25	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Rutland Heights, Mass. ¹	420	400	1,641,604.33	Hospital purchased while in process of construction; price included both land and buildings.
Muskogee, Okla. ¹	400	383	525,035.00	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
Tuskegee, Ala. ¹	609	560	2,112,088.50	Constructed from ground up.
Jefferson Barracks, Mo. ¹	343	319	1,392,715.99	Do.
Legion, Tex. ¹	480	347	1,426,602.00	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings.
American Lake, Wash. ¹	392	382	1,590,787.97	Constructed from ground up.
Northampton, Mass. ¹	555	551	3,007,269.64	Do.
Sunmount, N. Y. ¹	375	354	2,291,970.73	Do.
Chillicothe, Ohio. ¹	614	504	1,978,205.51	Do.
Castle Point, N. Y. ¹	400	390	2,411,536.00	Do.
Excelsior Springs, Mo. ¹	125		330,504.97	Hospital purchased; price included both land and buildings; temporarily closed to permit of enlargement.
Camp Custer, Mich. ¹	602	603	2,129,538.78	Constructed from ground up.
St. Cloud, Minn. ¹	494	468	1,861,483.61	Do.
Livermore, Calif. ¹	318	294	1,505,393.61	Do.
Aspinwall, Pa. ¹	226	204	1,450,506.58	Do.
San Fernando, Calif. ¹	230	228	1,189,723.61	Do.
North Chicago, Ill. ¹	660	660	1,790,748.49	Do.
Minneapolis, Minn. ¹	557	572	1,934,362.50	Do.
Bedford, Mass. ¹	492	422	2,058,666.67	Do.
Northport, Long Island, N. Y. ¹	944	943	3,844,431.18	Do.
Fargo, N. Dak. ¹	57	47	238,920.04	Do.
Total	22,508	20,518	70,547,664.72	

¹ Fireproof.

² Frame.

³ Investment shown is only since use as veterans' hospital.

⁴ Stucco.

⁵ Slow burning; brick walls, slate roofs, and wood floors.

NOTE.—Beds in frame buildings: 200 at Perry Point, 377 at Oteen, and 40 at Gulfport.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The records submitted do not include all of the veterans' hospitals, neither do they include those to be constructed out of the \$15,000,000 recently appropriated.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Does not the gentleman remember the incident that came before the committee of a constituent of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE], who was in St. Louis on the street, and there was not a bed available to be found, and we had to take special action in order to get a bed?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Oh, the gentleman might bring up some isolated case, but the thing back of that is this, the gentleman's own city is on this program here asking for some consideration at a later date.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. Oh, the gentleman from Oklahoma is very much mistaken about that. We are very well provided for. We have ample hospital facilities.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I may be wrong. It is probably at Quantico.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. We have an oversupply, and we have no idea of asking for one. Does not the gentleman also remember that at the very hearing there were then 44 or 144 in Washington waiting hospitalization here?

Mr. LEECH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In just a moment. The gentleman from Virginia brought to my attention a couple of isolated cases. I have brought to the attention of the House a statement from the Veterans' Bureau to show that they have 2,000 vacant beds, and that there are vacant beds around the area in other States which he has mentioned, in which one particular man could be hospitalized. Therefore, it is reasonable to deduce that there must be some peculiar condition connected with the veteran rather than the availability of hospital facilities.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman wants to be accurate, I know.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. HALE. I wish the gentleman would yield to answer this question.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. First, I made the statement that this bill was the entering wedge for more naval hospitals to take care of veterans patients. Let us see if I am right. According to the information contained in the hearings, hospitals will be proposed at Chelsea, Mass.; Newport, R. I.; Quantico, Va.—I was in error, and I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANKFORD]. It was at Quantico, instead of in the gentleman's city. Also Philadelphia, Pa.; Puget Sound, Wash.; Mare Island, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.; and Great Lakes, Ill.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I wish we had authority for one.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Can you not understand what this means? If this were a proposition to hospitalize veteran patients in veterans' hospitals I would not object to it, unless it could be shown that we have plenty of facilities to take care of those we now have.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. HALE. In the hearings before the committee on this bill and on the Washington hospital bill it appeared, as the House knows, that the Veterans' Bureau has been given the benefit of \$15,000,000 for a hospital program at this session of Congress.

It appeared also that there were approximately 6,000 war veterans in Government institutions, Army and Navy hospitals. I ask the gentleman in all fairness if the representatives of the Veterans' Bureau did not state to the Committee on Naval Affairs over and over again in those hearings that the \$15,000,000 hospital program did not take care of any patients in Government institutions, but took care of the needs in excess of the number of patients in the Government institutions, and that when the \$15,000,000 program was completed they would still keep and would have need to keep 6,000 patients in naval and Army hospitals?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not think so.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman himself asked that question more than four times, according to my recollection.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I will be glad for the gentleman to cite the record. I do not think he can do so.

Mr. HALE. It is in the hearings on the Washington hospital.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. If there is such a statement as that, I would be glad to have it read here, because I never desire to make a statement that does not dovetail with the facts. I would like to know where it is.

I will tell you what the record shows. At the present time, 7,284 beds in the naval hospitals. Peak load for 1929, 5,892

patients, of which 2,917 were veterans. The \$15,000,000 appropriated will take care of 3,900 new veteran patients. Therefore naval hospital facilities will not be needed when these hospitals have been completed, and when the 2,917 veteran patients are taken away from the Navy it will leave 3,309 vacant beds in the naval hospitals at the present time without proposed additions. If new hospitals are constructed at the places named in the hearing, then there will be over 10,000 vacant beds in the various naval hospitals, with no patients to fill the same, and in addition an increased personnel, which will increase the cost of maintenance to a figure unwarranted for any condition that exists at the present time.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Let me finish my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman. I want to give the operating costs of the many naval hospitals.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman tell us what he is reading from? Will the gentleman tell the Members of the House what individual he reads from?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am quoting from the record of the Navy Department as given during the hearings.

Mr. WOODRUFF. What information does that give us as to what is proposed to be done in regard to hospitals?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It is very evident that the gentleman has not very much confidence in the accuracy of my opinion.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to place in the Record the evidence of Admiral Riggs and the records furnished by the Medical Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

STATEMENT ON THE OPERATING COSTS OF THE NAVAL HOSPITALS
THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
Wednesday, January 29, 1930.

The committee this day met at 10.30 o'clock a. m., Hon. FRED A. BRITTEN (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. We have met again this morning for further consideration of H. R. 8886, which would provide for the construction of a new naval hospital here in Washington. Admiral Riggs is with us again and we will probably hear him further this morning.

The admiral has brought with him this morning a statement of the operating costs of the naval hospital in Washington, and it will be inserted in the record.

Yesterday the chairman asked the admiral for a comprehensive statement concerning the civilian employees at the naval hospital in Washington. That statement was furnished this morning, and it also will be included in the record. Running over it I find the largest item is 20 mess attendants, who receive \$67 a month. There are four chauffeurs, each of whom receives \$138.20 a month.

Are these civil-service employees?

Admiral RIGGS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The total number of employees is 102, and the total amount allotted in 1930 for them was \$142,097.96, and there was a total expended during 1929 of \$135,661.34.

Mr. VINSON. I had the Medical Corps furnish me a statement showing new construction required at naval hospitals within the continental limits of the United States to replace temporary war-time structures which are now in a state of rapid deterioration or inadequate to properly and safely house patients and duty personnel for the present authorized strength of the Navy and Marine Corps. It gives the estimated cost of such construction for the naval hospital at Chelsea, Mass., as \$150,000; at the naval hospital, Newport, R. I., \$100,000; at the naval hospital, Philadelphia, League Island, Pa., \$1,500,000; at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., \$1,500,000; at the naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill., \$1,650,000; at the naval hospital, Puget Sound, Wash., \$100,000; at the naval hospital, Mare Island, Calif., \$90,000; and at the naval hospital, San Diego, Calif., \$255,000; making a grand total for all hospitals of \$5,345,000.

Mr. EVANS. Is that contemplated in the bill that passed the House a few days ago?

Mr. VINSON. No; this is strictly naval hospitals.

(The statements in question read as follows):

Operating cost of naval hospital, Washington, D. C.

Total cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$346,157.03
Total sick days	134,293
Daily average of patients	367.93
Cost per patient per diem	\$2.5776
Total cost is divided between naval hospital fund and the appropriation "Medical Department," as follows:	
Naval hospital fund:	
For food	\$129,670.27
For supplies	69,150.73
Total	198,821.00

Medical Department:	
Salaries and wages	\$126,303.87
Supplies	21,032.16
Total	\$147,336.03
	346,157.03

From the above expenditures the Veterans' Bureau reimbursed the Navy as follows:

Naval hospital fund:	
For food	\$57,443.63
For supplies	44,421.50
Total	\$101,865.13
Medical Department:	
Services	\$81,119.94
Supplies	13,489.45
Total	94,609.39

Total reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau 196,474.52

All other Federal departments reimbursed the Navy as follows:

Naval hospital fund	\$267.46
The total reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau and other Federal departments, therefore, are as follows:	
Naval hospital fund	\$102,132.59
Medical Department	94,609.39
Total	196,741.98

Leaving the sum of \$149,415.05 from all sources actually expended for the Navy. Of this amount \$96,688.41 was expended from the naval hospital fund and \$52,726.64 from the appropriation "Medical Department." Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department" (\$52,726.64) represent the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Portsmouth, N. H.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$83,596.16
Total sick days	22,155
Daily average of patients	60.70
Cost per patient per diem	\$3.7732

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$23,253.43
Supplies	33,182.72
	56,436.15
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	24,572.93
Supplies	2,587.08
	27,160.01
	83,596.16

Reimbursements:	
From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$7,126.27
Supplies	16,809.02
	\$23,935.29
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	12,557.07
Supplies	1,291.49
	13,848.56
	37,783.85
From other Federal departments—	
Naval hospital fund	4,141.43
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	28.92
	4,170.35
	41,954.20

Recapitulation:	
Net operating expenditures	83,596.16
Less reimbursements—	
Naval hospital fund	\$23,076.72
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	13,877.48
	41,954.20
Total cost to Navy	41,641.96
Naval hospital fund	\$28,359.43
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	13,282.53

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$13,282.53) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Portsmouth, N. H.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 chauffeur	\$139.36
1 engineman	180.96
1 joiner	185.12
3 laborers	116.48
1 chief cook	123.00
1 first cook	101.00
1 second cook	84.00
1 chief mess attendant	78.00
3 mess attendants	67.00
1 housekeeper	78.00
1 bookkeeper	129.22
1 stenographer	129.22
Total number of civilian employees, 16.	

Operating cost of naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$439,097.04
Total sick days	123,699
Daily average of patients	338.90
Net per diem cost per patient	\$3.5497

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$125,478.03
Supplies	124,890.13
	250,368.16
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	166,451.16
Supplies	22,277.72
	188,728.88
	439,097.04

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$52,198.32
Supplies	83,761.06
	135,959.38
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	112,159.66
Supplies	15,016.71
	127,176.37
	263,135.75
From other Government departments—	
Naval hospital fund	346.93
	263,482.68

Recapitulation:

Net operating cost	439,097.04
Less	
Reimbursements—	
Hospital fund	\$136,306.31
Medical Department	127,176.37
	263,482.68

Total cost to Navy	175,614.36
Hospital fund	\$114,061.85
Medical Department	61,552.51

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$61,552.51) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$178.88
5 chauffeurs	139.36
4 enginemen	180.96
5 firemen	147.68
1 chief mechanic	253.76
1 teamster	120.04
1 electrician	195.52
3 joiners	185.12
4 painters	185.12
1 head painter	195.52
12 laborers, common	116.48
5 laborers, classified	116.48
1 machinist	178.88
1 gardener	131.04
1 pipe fitter	195.52
1 plumber	195.52
1 chief launderer	146.00
6 third laundrerers	78.00
1 laborer, common	116.48
1 sewer	118.56
1 baker	112.00
1 steward	158.00
2 first cooks	101.00
4 second cooks	84.00
1 meat cutter	112.00
2 chief mess attendants	78.00
19 mess attendants	67.00
1 pantryman	78.00
1 first cook	101.00
6 maids	50.00
1 mess attendant	67.00
1 housekeeper	78.00
1 laborer, common	116.48
1 bookkeeper	151.06
2 stenographers	140.14
2 typists	129.22
4 stenographers	129.22
1 telephone operator	116.48
1 stockman	151.84
1 librarian	155.00
3 occupational therapy aides	150.00
Total number of employees, 112.	

Operating cost of naval hospital, Newport, R. I.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$210,224.98
Total sick days	56,413
Daily average of patients	154.56
Cost per patient per diem	\$3.7265

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$56,888.46
Supplies	66,780.69
	123,669.15

Net operating expenses—Continued.

Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine

and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	\$72,596.19
Supplies	13,959.64
	\$86,555.83
	210,224.98

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$8,820.83
Supplies	16,814.83
	25,635.66
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	18,649.55
Supplies	3,307.19
	21,956.74
	47,592.40
From other Government departments—	
Naval hospital fund	138.18
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	20.61
	158.79
	47,751.19

Recapitulation:

Net operating cost	210,224.98
Less reimbursements—	
Naval hospital fund	\$25,773.84
Medical Department	21,977.35
	47,751.19

Total cost to Navy	162,473.79
Of which hospital fund is	\$97,895.31
And Medical Department is	64,578.48

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$64,578.48) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Newport, R. I.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$178.88
1 chauffeur	133.12
1 engineman	174.72
5 firemen	143.52
1 laborer	110.24
1 chief mechanic	253.76
1 electrician	191.36
1 joiner	180.96
1 painter	180.96
1 pipe fitter	191.36
1 helper, general	122.72
1 gardener	131.04
3 laborers	110.24
2 maids	50.00
1 policeman	116.48
1 chief launderer	146.00
1 second launderer	80.00
3 third laundrerers	68.00
1 sewer	114.40
1 chief cook	123.00
2 first cooks	91.00
1 second cook	79.00
Do	74.00
5 mess attendants	57.00
1 mess attendant	62.00
1 maid	50.00
1 second cook	74.00
1 mess attendant	62.00
2 maids	45.00
1 typewriter (bookkeeper)	161.98
2 stenographers	140.14
1 occupational therapy aide	150.00
Total number of employees, 48.	

Operating cost of naval hospital, New York, N. Y.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$632,921.04
Total sick days	244,396
Daily average of patients	669.58
Cost per patient per diem	\$2.5898

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$218,411.73
Supplies	182,612.78
	\$401,024.51
Medical department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	189,994.86
Supplies	41,901.67
	231,896.53
	\$632,921.04

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	104,514.15
Supplies	121,312.75
	225,826.90
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	126,984.67
Supplies	28,204.27
	155,188.94
	881,015.84

Reimbursements—Continued.

From other Government departments—Naval hospital fund	\$861. 83
	381, 877. 17
Recapitulation:	
Net operating cost	632, 921. 04
Less reimbursements—	
Hospital fund	\$226, 688. 23
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	155, 188. 94
	381, 877. 17
Total cost to Navy	251, 043. 87
Hospital fund	\$174, 336. 28
Medical Department	76, 707. 59

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$75,707.59) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, New York, N. Y.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 head motor mechanic	\$199. 68
5 chauffeurs	147. 68
4 enginemen	189. 28
6 firemen	153. 92
1 laborer	116. 48
2 laborers (October–March)	116. 48
1 chief mechanic	264. 16
1 helper, machinist	126. 88
2 electricians	201. 76
2 pipefitters (1 temporary)	201. 76
1 plumber	201. 76
2 machinists	189. 28
1 gardener	131. 04
4 joiners	191. 36
5 painters	191. 36
2 head laborers (classified)	126. 88
9 laborers (classified)	116. 48
12 laborers (common)	116. 48
2 laborers (common) (April–September)	116. 48
1 chief launderer	146. 00
1 second launderer	90. 00
Do	85. 00
3 second laundrerers	80. 00
3 third laundrerers	78. 00
2 third laundrerers	73. 00
1 sewer	118. 56
1 steward	168. 00
1 baker	112. 00
1 chief cook	123. 00
1 meat cutter	112. 00
4 first cooks	101. 00
2 second cooks	84. 00
1 chief mess attendant	78. 00
1 pantryman	78. 00
9 mess attendants	67. 00
5 mess attendants	62. 00
4 mess attendants	57. 00
2 mess attendants (October–March)	57. 00
3 mess attendants	67. 00
1 first cook	101. 00
1 second cook	84. 00
8 maids	50. 00
1 mess attendant	67. 00
Do	62. 00
1 bookkeeper	151. 06
2 stenographers	151. 06
2 typewriters	151. 06
2 stenographers	129. 22
2 typewriters	129. 22
1 teacher	187. 00
2 aides	150. 00

Total number of employees, 134.

Operating cost of naval hospital, League Island, Pa.

Total cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$373, 290. 89
Total sick days	150. 207
Daily average of patients	411. 53
Cost per patient per diem	\$2. 4852

Total cost is divided between naval hospital fund and the appropriation "Medical department," as follows:

Naval hospital fund:	
For food	\$135, 673. 70
For supplies	102, 954. 64
Total	\$238, 628. 34
Medical department:	
Salaries and wages	\$108, 665. 71
Supplies	25, 996. 84
Total	134, 662. 55
	373, 290. 89

From the above expenditures the Veterans' Bureau reimbursed the Navy as follows:

Naval hospital fund:	
For food	\$61, 870. 95
For supplies	69, 069. 99
Total	\$130, 940. 94
Medical department:	
Services	\$72, 664. 12
Supplies	17, 411. 52
Total	90, 075. 64
Total reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau	221, 016. 58

All other Federal departments reimbursed the Navy as follows:

Naval hospital fund	\$227. 94
Medical department	85. 75
Total	313. 69
The total reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau and other Federal departments, therefore, are as follows:	
Naval hospital fund	\$131, 168. 88
Medical department	90, 161. 39
Total	221, 330. 27

Leaving the sum of \$151,960.62 from all sources actually expended for the Navy. Of this amount \$107,459.46 was expended from the naval hospital fund and \$44,501.16 from the appropriation "Medical Department." Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department" (\$44,501.16) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, League Island, Pa.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$178. 88
3 chauffeurs	133. 12
1 chief mechanic	253. 76
4 joiners	180. 96
1 electrician	191. 36
2 plumbers	191. 36
3 painters	180. 96
9 laborers, classified	110. 24
1 gardener	131. 04
1 chief launderer	146. 00
1 first launderer	112. 00
1 second launderer	85. 00
2 second laundrerers	80. 00
2 third laundrerers	78. 00
Do	73. 00
1 sewer	114. 40
1 second cook	84. 00
2 mess attendants	67. 00
6 maids	45. 00
1 housekeeper	78. 00
1 chief cook	123. 00
1 baker	102. 00
2 first cooks	101. 00
1 first cook	96. 00
1 second cook	84. 00
Do	79. 00
2 second cooks	74. 00
1 meat cutter	112. 00
1 chief mess attendant	78. 00
6 mess attendants	67. 00
5 mess attendants	62. 00
1 mess attendant	57. 00
1 stockman	128. 96
1 clerk (bookkeeper)	169. 26
1 clerk	140. 14
1 stenographer	129. 22
1 typist	129. 22
1 clerk	129. 22
2 stenographers	116. 48
1 typist	116. 48
1 occupational therapy aid	150. 00

Total number of employees, 78.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Annapolis, Md.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$153, 865. 36
Total sick days	21, 794
Daily average of patients	59. 71
Cost per patient per diem	\$7. 06

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$39, 892. 92
Supplies	44, 715. 71
	84, 608. 63
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	62, 288. 53
Supplies	6, 968. 20
	69, 256. 73
	153, 865. 36

Reimbursements:

From other Government departments, naval hospital fund	298. 59
	153, 566. 77

Recapitulation:

Net operating expenditures	153, 865. 36
Less reimbursements, naval hospital fund	298. 59
Total cost to Navy	153, 566. 77

Naval hospital fund	84, 310. 04
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	69, 256. 73
Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$69,256.73), represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.	

United States naval hospital, Annapolis, Md.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
3 chauffeurs	\$133. 12
4 firemen	143. 52
1 machinist	178. 88
1 electrician	191. 36
1 joiner	180. 96
7 laborers, common	110. 24
2 laborers, classified	110. 24

	Pay per month
2 painters.....	\$180.96
1 gardener.....	131.04
1 plumber.....	191.36
2 third laundress.....	62.00
1 chief cook.....	112.00
2 first cooks.....	95.00
1 second cook.....	78.00
1 chief mess attendant.....	73.00
9 mess attendants.....	62.00
1 second cook.....	78.00
1 mess attendant.....	62.00
3 maids.....	40.00
1 bookkeeper.....	140.14
2 typists.....	129.22
Total number of employees, 47.	

Operating cost of naval hospital, Norfolk, Va.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$486,980.77
Total sick days.....	172,686
Daily average of patients.....	573.11
Cost per patient per diem.....	\$2.82

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	\$162,538.79
Supplies.....	160,693.25
	323,232.04
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	134,020.72
Supplies.....	29,728.01
	163,748.73
	\$686,980.77

Reimbursements:	
From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	28,340.97
Supplies.....	42,477.70
	70,818.67
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	35,546.63
Supplies.....	7,676.62
	43,223.25
	114,041.92

From other Government departments—	
Naval hospital fund.....	306.23
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	2.68
	308.91
	114,350.83

Recapitulation:	
Net operating cost.....	486,980.77
Less—Reimbursements—	
Hospital fund.....	\$71,124.90
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	43,225.93
	114,350.83

Total cost to Navy.....	372,629.94
Hospital fund.....	\$252,107.14
Medical Department.....	120,522.80

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$120,522.80), represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Norfolk, Va.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist.....	\$178.88
4 chauffeurs.....	126.88
1 chauffeur.....	116.48
1 chief mechanic.....	253.76
5 enginemen.....	174.72
9 firemen.....	143.52
1 plumber.....	191.36
1 pipefitter.....	170.56
1 pipefitter's helper.....	112.32
2 electricians.....	191.36
4 joiners.....	180.96
1 head painter.....	191.36
4 painters.....	180.96
1 head laborer.....	108.08
17 laborers.....	96.68
1 cement finisher.....	183.04
1 gardener.....	131.04
1 maid.....	30.00
1 chief launderer.....	129.00
1 second launderer.....	78.00
Do.....	68.00
6 third laundress.....	57.00
1 sewer.....	114.40
1 chief cook.....	112.00
4 first cooks.....	90.00
2 second cooks.....	78.00
Do.....	73.00
1 baker.....	96.00
1 meat cutter.....	101.00
5 mess attendants.....	62.00
Do.....	57.00
15 mess attendants.....	52.00
2 pantrymen.....	63.00
2 second cooks.....	68.00
1 mess attendant.....	57.00
Do.....	52.00

	Pay per month
5 maids.....	\$30.00
1 housekeeper.....	67.00
1 clerk.....	169.26
1 typewriter.....	151.06
4 typewriters.....	140.14
1 typewriter.....	129.22
1 telephone operator.....	118.48
1 stockman.....	139.36
1 aide.....	150.00
1 librarian.....	155.00

Total number of employees, 125.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Charleston, S. C.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$62,699.72
Total sick days.....	11,910
Daily average of patients.....	32.63
Cost per patient per diem.....	\$5.8522

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	\$15,461.54
Supplies.....	28,891.74
	\$44,353.28
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	18,988.15
Supplies.....	6,348.29
	25,346.44
	69,699.72

Reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	214.31
Supplies.....	552.79
	767.10
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	464.92
Supplies.....	140.65
	605.57
	1,372.67

Recapitulation:	
Net operating expenditures.....	69,699.72
Less reimbursements—	
Hospital fund.....	\$767.10
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	605.57
	1,372.67

Total cost to Navy.....	68,327.05
Hospital fund.....	\$43,586.18
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	24,740.87

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$24,740.87), represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Charleston, S. C.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 chauffeur.....	\$116.48
1 electrician.....	180.96
1 joiner.....	176.80
1 painter.....	168.48
1 laborer, classified.....	74.88
2 laborers.....	74.88
1 laborer (3 months).....	74.88
2 first cooks.....	90.00
2 mess attendants.....	56.00
1 typist.....	140.14

Total number of employees, 13.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Parris Island, S. C.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$71,527.45
Total sick days.....	21,914
Daily average of patients.....	60.04
Cost per patient per diem.....	\$3.264

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	\$22,662.53
Supplies.....	23,527.55
	46,190.08
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	20,147.13
Supplies.....	5,190.24
	25,337.37
	71,527.45

Reimbursements:	
From other Government departments—Naval hospital fund.....	940.38

Recapitulation:	
Net operating expenditures.....	71,527.45
Less reimbursements, naval hospital fund.....	940.38

Total cost to Navy.....	70,587.07
Naval hospital fund.....	\$45,249.70
Medical department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	25,337.37

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$25,337.37) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Parris Island, S. C.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 chauffeur.....	\$116.48
1 plumber.....	183.04
1 joiner.....	176.80
1 painter.....	168.48
3 laborers.....	74.88
1 first cook.....	90.00
2 second cooks.....	73.00
1 mess attendant.....	56.00
Do.....	51.00
1 housekeeper.....	46.00
1 maid.....	28.00
1 bookkeeper.....	92.82-103.74

Total number of employees, 15.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$101,249.88
Total sick days.....	374.07
Daily average of patients.....	102.48
Cost per patient per diem.....	\$2.7067

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	\$35,828.64
Supplies.....	21,313.26
	57,141.90
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	37,546.30
Supplies.....	6,561.68
	44,107.98
	101,249.88

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food.....	13,611.20
Supplies.....	12,306.86
	25,918.06
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages.....	21,274.15
Supplies.....	3,647.48
	24,921.63
	50,839.69
From other Government departments—	
Naval hospital fund.....	188.06
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	35.61
	\$223.67
	51,063.36

Recapitulation:

Net operating expenditures.....	101,249.88
Less reimbursements—	
Hospital fund.....	\$26,106.12
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	24,957.24
	51,063.36
Total cost to Navy:	
Hospital fund.....	31,035.78
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.....	19,150.74
	50,186.52

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$19,150.74), represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 chauffeur.....	\$120.64
1 engineman.....	166.40
4 firemen.....	135.20
1 joiner.....	176.80
1 painter.....	168.48
1 plumber.....	180.96
1 gardener.....	131.04
3 policemen.....	116.48
3 laborers, common.....	74.80
1 housekeeper.....	46.00
1 second launderer.....	67.00
2 third launders.....	46.00
1 sewer.....	95.68
1 first cook.....	90.00
2 second cooks.....	73.00
1 chief mess attendant.....	67.00
1 mess attendant.....	56.00
Do.....	51.00
Do.....	46.00
1 housekeeper.....	46.00
1 clerk.....	129.22

Total number of employees, 30.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.

Total cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$516,465.98
Total sick days.....	185.681
Daily average of patients.....	508.72
Cost per patient per diem.....	2.7815

Total cost is divided between naval hospital fund and the appropriation "Medical Department," as follows:

Naval hospital fund:	
For food.....	\$149,335.12
For supplies.....	148,307.00
Total.....	\$297,642.12
Medical Department:	
Salaries and wages.....	198,960.43
Supplies.....	19,863.43
Total.....	218,823.86
	516,465.98

From the above expenditures the Veterans' Bureau reimbursed the Navy, as follows:

Naval hospital fund:	
For food.....	\$82,405.38
For supplies.....	111,916.42
Total.....	\$194,321.80
Medical Department:	
Services.....	150,144.02
Supplies.....	14,902.36
Total.....	165,046.38
Total reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau.....	359,368.18

United States naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist.....	\$187.20
6 chauffeurs.....	143.52
1 chief mechanic.....	262.08
2 enginemen.....	183.04
6 firemen.....	153.92
8 laborers.....	118.56
1 chief mechanic.....	262.08
2 enginemen.....	183.04
5 firemen.....	153.92
5 laborers.....	118.56
1 chief mechanic.....	262.08
1 electrician.....	197.60
1 sheet-metal worker.....	195.52
1 gardener.....	131.04
5 joiners.....	191.36
5 painters.....	187.20
2 plumbers.....	195.52
2 helpers, electrician.....	126.88
1 helper, general.....	122.72
2 pipe fitters.....	195.52
13 laborers, common.....	118.56
3 laborers, classified.....	118.56
1 maid.....	50.00
1 chief launderer.....	146.00
1 first launderer.....	112.00
2 second launders.....	90.00
5 third launders.....	78.00
1 sewer.....	104.00
1 chief cook.....	123.00
1 meat cutter.....	112.00
5 first cooks.....	101.00
3 second cooks.....	84.00
1 baker.....	112.00
8 chief mess attendants.....	78.00
2 pantrymen.....	78.00
14 mess attendants.....	67.00
2 first cooks.....	101.00
1 pantryman.....	78.00
1 mess attendant.....	67.00
5 maids.....	50.00
1 bookkeeper.....	169.26
1 typewriter.....	140.14
2 typewriters.....	129.22
1 stockman.....	128.96
3 typewriters.....	116.48
1 clerk.....	116.48
2 aides.....	150.00
1 teacher.....	150.00

Total number of employees, 142.

All other Federal departments reimbursed the Navy as follows:

Naval hospital fund.....	\$847.25
The total reimbursements from Veterans' Bureau and other Federal departments, therefore, are as follows:	
Naval hospital fund.....	\$195,169.05
Medical Department.....	165,046.38
Total.....	360,215.43

Leaving the sum of \$156,250.55 from all sources actually expended for the Navy. Of this amount, \$102,473.07 was expended from the naval hospital fund and \$53,777.48 from the appropriation "Medical Department." Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department" (\$53,777.48) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Mare Island, Calif.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$414,600.50
Total sick days.....	152.117
Daily average of patients.....	416.76
Cost per patient per diem.....	\$2.7255

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—		
Food	\$129,417.46	
Supplies	130,211.43	
		\$259,628.89
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages	125,603.24	
Supplies	29,368.37	
		154,971.61
		<u>414,600.50</u>

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—		
Naval hospital fund—		
Food	35,219.46	
Supplies	52,816.37	
		88,035.83
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages	48,782.29	
Supplies	11,450.41	
		60,232.70

From other Government departments, naval hospital fund	148,268.53	
	3,894.27	
	<u>152,162.80</u>	

Recapitulation:

Net operating expenditures	414,600.50	
Less reimbursements—		
Hospital fund	\$91,930.10	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	60,232.70	
	<u>152,162.80</u>	

Total cost to Navy

Naval hospital fund	\$167,698.79	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	94,738.91	

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$94,738.91) represent the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Mare Island, Calif.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$191.36
4 chauffeurs	153.92
5 firemen	160.16
1 helper, general	126.88
1 chief mechanic	266.24
2 electricians	205.92
2 joiners	201.76
1 painter	197.60
2 plumbers	205.92
1 helper, general	126.88
1 gardener	151.84
14 laborers	116.48
1 chief launderer	136.00
1 first launderer	102.00
4 second laundress	90.00
1 sewer	114.40
1 chief cook	123.00
1 baker	102.00
1 meat cutter	112.00
3 first cooks	101.00
3 second cooks	84.00
Do	79.00
1 chief mess attendant	78.00
4 pantrymen	73.00
13 mess attendants	67.00
1 housekeeper	78.00
2 mess attendants	67.00
1 bookkeeper	169.26
3 stenographers	129.22
1 stenographer	116.48
1 stockman	128.96
1 occupational therapy aide	150.00

Total number of employees, 82.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Puget Sound, Wash.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$158,260.47
Total sick days	52,291
Daily average of patients	143.26
Cost per patient per diem	<u>\$3.0266</u>

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—		
Food	\$48,730.81	
Supplies	44,268.55	
		92,999.36
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages	51,795.35	
Supplies	13,465.76	
		65,261.11
		<u>158,260.47</u>

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—		
Naval hospital fund—		
Food	\$9,649.92	
Supplies	13,304.01	
		\$22,958.93
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages	15,626.59	
Supplies	4,132.86	
		19,759.45
		<u>42,718.38</u>

From other Government departments—

Naval hospital fund	1,419.13	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	40.61	
		1,459.74
		<u>44,173.12</u>

Recapitulation:

Net operating expenditures	158,260.47	
Less reimbursements—		
Hospital fund	24,373.06	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	19,800.06	
	<u>44,173.12</u>	

Total cost to Navy

Hospital fund	68,626.30	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	45,461.05	

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$45,461.05) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Puget Sound, Wash.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$191.36
2 chauffeurs	153.92
1 head mechanic	203.84
2 helpers, general	126.88
1 joiner	201.76
1 painter	197.60
5 laborers	116.48
1 gardener	151.84
1 sewer	114.40
1 machine operator	147.68
1 first cook	101.00
1 second cook	84.00
3 second cooks	79.00
1 second cook	74.00
1 chief mess attendant	78.00
2 mess attendants	67.00
1 mess attendant	62.00
1 second cook	74.00
2 maids	50.00
1 bookkeeper	151.06
1 stenographer and typist	129.22
1 typewriter	140.14

Total number of employees, 32.

Operating cost of naval hospital, San Diego, Calif.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$535,871.37
Total sick days	276,958
Daily average of patients	758.79
Cost per patient per diem	<u>\$1.9348</u>

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—		
Food	\$221,991.04	
Supplies	115,595.32	
		\$337,586.36
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages	147,499.26	
Supplies	50,785.75	
		198,285.01
		<u>\$535,871.37</u>

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—		
Naval hospital fund—		
Food	31,917.94	
Supplies	21,835.35	
		53,753.29
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages	28,385.61	
Supplies	9,418.33	
		37,803.94
		<u>91,557.23</u>
From other Government departments—		
Naval hospital fund	2,371.26	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	130.79	
		2,502.05
		<u>94,059.28</u>

Recapitulation:	
Net operating expenditures	\$535,871.37
Less reimbursements—	
Naval hospital fund	\$56,124.55
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	37,934.73
	<u>94,059.28</u>

Total cost to Navy	441,812.09
Naval hospital fund	281,461.81
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	160,350.28

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$160,350.28) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, San Diego, Calif.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$191.36
5 chauffeurs	147.68
4 firemen	158.08
1 machinist	191.36
1 chief machinist	266.24
1 machinist	191.36
1 electrician	205.92
Do	185.12
2 plumbers	205.92
3 joiners	201.76
2 painters	197.60
1 helper, pipefitter	131.04
1 helper, general	126.88
1 gardener	131.04
19 laborers	116.48
3 policemen	116.48
1 sewer	114.40
1 steward	148.00
1 meat cutter	112.00
5 first cooks	101.00
7 second cooks	84.00
1 chief mess attendant	78.00
2 mess attendants	67.00
10 mess attendants	62.00
2 mess attendants	57.00
1 pantryman	78.00
3 pantrymen	73.00
1 pantryman	68.00
1 first cook	101.00
1 second cook	84.00
2 mess attendants	62.00
4 mess attendants	57.00
1 housekeeper	78.00
3 maids	50.00
1 bookkeeper	169.26
1 typewriter	140.14
4 typewriters	129.22
3 typewriters	116.48
1 telephone operator	116.48
1 stockman	151.84
1 aide	150.00

Total number of employees, 106.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$130,400.78
Total sick days	23,137
Daily average of patients	63.39
Cost per patient per diem	<u>\$5.6360</u>

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$29,742.34
Supplies	34,379.65
	<u>\$64,121.99</u>

Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	56,055.64
Supplies	10,223.15
	<u>66,278.79</u>

Reimbursements:	
From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	324.82
Supplies	519.32
	<u>844.14</u>
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	1,223.30
Supplies	187.09
	<u>1,410.39</u>

From other Government departments—	
Naval hospital fund	2,254.53
	<u>2,611.08</u>

Recapitulation:	
Net operating cost	130,400.78
Less reimbursements—	
Naval hospital fund	\$3,455.22
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	1,410.39
	<u>4,865.61</u>

Total cost to Navy	125,535.17
Naval hospital fund	\$60,666.77
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	64,868.40

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$64,868.40) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1920:

	Pay per month
3 chauffeurs	\$139.86
1 machinist	205.92
4 firemen	174.72
1 chief cook	123.00
1 first cook	101.00
3 second cooks	84.00
1 chief mess attendant	78.00
1 first cook	101.00
1 mess attendant	67.00
1 head mechanic (electrician)	230.88
1 plumber	220.48
1 joiner	216.32
1 painter	212.16
8 laborers, common	93.60
1 helper, general	126.88
3 laborers, classified	93.60
1 sewer (5 days per week)	100.32
1 clerk C	154.70
1 clerk D	118.30
	<u>131.04</u>

Total number of employees, 39.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Guam, Midway Islands

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$69,709.47
Total sick days	39,583
Daily average of patients	109.45
Cost per patient per diem	<u>\$1.7611</u>

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$23,287.70
Supplies	26,389.67
	<u>\$49,677.37</u>

Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	8,379.89
Supplies	11,652.21
	<u>20,032.10</u>
	<u>\$69,709.47</u>

Reimbursements:	
From Veterans' Bureau—	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$16.60
Supplies	65.48
	<u>82.08</u>

Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	21.75
Supplies	27.07
	<u>48.82</u>

From other Government departments—	
Naval hospital fund	130.90
	<u>440.94</u>

Recapitulation:	
Net operating cost	69,709.47
Less reimbursements—	
Naval hospital fund	\$523.02
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	48.82
	<u>571.84</u>

Total cost to Navy	69,137.63
Naval hospital fund	\$49,154.35
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	19,983.28

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$19,983.28), represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Guam, Midway Islands

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 machinist	\$66.56
1 chauffeur	55.00
1 fireman	43.68
1 chief mechanic	96.00
1 joiner	66.56
1 painter	41.60
1 policeman	31.00
2 laborers	27.04
5 third laundresses	15.00
1 first cook	50.00
1 second cook	35.00
3 mess attendants	12.00
2 mess attendants	12.00
1 messenger	25.48

Total number of employees, 22.

Operating cost of naval hospital, Canacao, P. I.

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929	\$162,133.00
Total sick days	75,172
Daily average of patients	205.95
Cost per patient per diem	<u>\$2.1568</u>

Net operating expenditures:	
Naval hospital fund—	
Food	\$64,581.62
Supplies	52,746.00
	<u>\$117,327.62</u>

Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery—	
Salaries and wages	28,672.27
Supplies	16,133.11
	<u>44,805.38</u>
	<u>\$162,133.00</u>

Reimbursements:

From Veterans' Bureau—		
Naval hospital fund—		
Food.....	\$542.99	
Supplies.....	668.65	
		\$1,231.64
Medical Department,		
Bureau of Medicine		
and Surgery.....		
Salaries and wages	362.34	
Supplies.....	224.93	
		587.27
		\$1,818.91
From other Government departments—		
Naval hospital fund.....		5,161.52
		6,980.43
Recapitulation:		
Net operating cost.....		162,133.00
Less reimbursements—		
Naval hospital fund.....	\$6,393.16	
Medical Department, Bureau of		
Medicine and Surgery.....	587.27	
		6,980.43
Total cost to Navy.....		155,152.57
Naval hospital fund.....	110,934.46	
Medical Department, Bureau of Medi-		
cine and Surgery.....	44,218.11	

Expenditures from the appropriation "Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery" (\$44,218.11) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, Canacao, P. I.

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
2 chauffeurs.....	\$41.60
1 machinist.....	56.16
2 enginemen.....	41.60
2 firemen.....	41.60
1 electrician.....	56.16
1 chief mechanic.....	158.08
1 assistant chief mechanic.....	100.00
2 joiners.....	56.16
1 joiner.....	43.68
1 painter.....	45.76
Do.....	33.28
11 laborers.....	31.20
5 laborers.....	24.96
4 laborers.....	18.72
1 cement worker.....	29.12
1 gardener.....	24.96
1 plumber.....	56.16
Do.....	43.68
1 sergeant of police.....	47.84
5 policemen.....	41.60
1 first launderer.....	26.00
3 third laundress.....	21.84
1 sewer.....	18.72
1 chief cook.....	60.00
1 first cook.....	50.00
4 second cooks.....	23.40
4 mess attendants.....	18.72
3 pantrymen.....	16.64
1 first cook.....	45.00
3 pantrymen.....	16.64
1 stenographer.....	47.32
1 bookkeeper.....	47.32

Total number of employees, 69.

Operating cost of naval hospital, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands

Cost of operating expenses for fiscal year 1929.....	\$18,588.33
Total sick days.....	3,302
Daily average of patients.....	9.05
Cost per patient per diem.....	\$5.6294

Net operating expenditures:

Naval hospital fund—		
Food.....	\$6,325.20	
Supplies.....	5,924.23	
		\$12,249.43
Medical Department, Bureau		
of Medicine and Surgery—		
Salaries and wages.....	3,578.88	
Supplies.....	2,760.02	
		6,338.90
		\$18,588.33

Recapitulation:

Net operating expenditures	18,588.33
Total cost to Navy	18,588.33
Naval hospital fund	\$12,249.43
Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	6,338.90

Expenditures from the appropriation Medical Department, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (\$6,338.90) represents the actual amount withdrawn from the Treasury.

United States naval hospital, St. Thomas, Virgin Islands

Total allowed civilian complement fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 chauffeur.....	\$60.00
2 laborers.....	37.50
1 joiner.....	58.24
1 first cook.....	50.00
1 second cook.....	25.00
2 mess attendants.....	15.00

Total number of employees, 8.

United States naval hospital, Washington, D. C.

Total allowed civilian complement, fiscal year 1929:

	Pay per month
1 head chauffeur.....	\$145.60
4 chauffeurs.....	138.20
1 chief mechanic.....	257.92
3 enginemen.....	174.72
5 firemen.....	145.60
1 laborer.....	110.24
1 machinist.....	183.04
Do.....	172.64
1 helper, general.....	118.56
1 pipe fitter.....	193.44
1 plumber.....	193.44
1 chief mess attendant.....	78.00
1 mess attendant.....	62.00
3 maids.....	50.00
3 mess attendants.....	67.00
4 maids.....	50.00
1 chief launderer.....	146.00
6 third laundress.....	78.00
1 clerk.....	182.00
2 stenotypists.....	159.24
1 stenotypist.....	138.32
2 aides, vocational.....	160.00
1 electrician.....	193.44
1 assistant chief machinist.....	193.44
9 laborers.....	110.24
1 helper, general.....	118.56
2 joiners.....	183.04
3 painters.....	183.04
1 cement finisher.....	187.20
1 chief cook.....	123.00
3 first cooks.....	101.00
3 second cooks.....	84.00
1 meat cutter.....	112.00
20 mess attendants.....	67.00
1 mess attendant.....	57.00
1 housekeeper.....	78.00
2 cooks.....	84.00
1 sewer.....	114.00
1 first launderer.....	112.00
2 telephone operators.....	120.64
1 typist.....	156.52
2 typists.....	149.24
1 librarian.....	168.66
1 laborer.....	110.24

Total number of employees, 102.

Total expended during 1929, \$135,661.34.

Total allotment for 1930, \$142,097.96.

NOTE.—The total expended for civil employees during fiscal year 1929 in the amount of \$135,661.34 represents all wages paid. Of this amount \$9,357.47 has been deducted for the following: Heat, light, and power furnished the Naval Medical School; laundry services rendered other Medical Department activities in Washington, leaving an actual charge to the hospital of \$126,303.87.

New construction is required at naval hospitals within the continental limits of the United States to replace temporary war-time structures which are now in a state of rapid deterioration or inadequate to properly and safely house patients and duty personnel for the present authorized strength of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass.

Daily average of patients for 6 years.....	139.7
Peak load.....	160

A new wing is necessary to accommodate the refrigerating plant in the basement and chemical and bacteriological laboratories on the first floor. These facilities are now located in temporary structures and are inadequate. X-ray laboratories, dental operating rooms, and dental prosthetic laboratories on the second floor. These facilities are now located in small inadequate rooms in the basement of the main building.

Estimated cost..... \$150,000

Naval hospital, Newport, R. I.

A new barracks for 60 Hospital Corps men is recommended.

The present barracks is a temporary "war-time" structure, rapidly deteriorating and a fire hazard.

Estimated cost..... \$100,000

Naval hospital, Philadelphia (League Island), Pa.

Daily average of patients for 6 years.....	175.7
Peak load.....	231

All buildings of present hospital are temporary "war-time" structures, badly deteriorated, and an extreme fire hazard. An entire new hospital if required. From past experiences it is estimated that a capacity of 300 beds will be sufficient for normal requirements.

Estimated cost..... \$1,500,000

Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va.

Daily average of patients.....	70
Peak load.....	210

Nearly all medical activity at this station is confined to the Marine Corps personnel. A permanent hospital with accommodations for 300 patients, ultimately.

Estimated cost..... \$1,500,000

Two hundred beds to start with, and the remaining construction to be withheld until conditions warrant it.

Naval hospital, Great Lakes, Ill.

Daily average of patients..... 90
Peak load..... 225

The major portion of patients admitted to this hospital are recruits from the naval training station. Epidemics during severe winter weather are more frequent. Therefore, the peak load is considered the best average. Three hundred and seventy beds is considered a safe minimum. The present permanent building will be used for administrative purposes.

Estimated cost..... \$1,650,000

Naval hospital, Puget Sound, Wash.

New barracks for 60 Hospital Corps men. They are now housed in temporary war-time structures.

Estimated cost..... \$100,000

Naval hospital, Mare Island, Calif.

Quarters for 35 female nurses. Now housed in a temporary war-time structure.

Estimated cost..... \$90,000

Naval hospital, San Diego, Calif.

Barracks for 200 Hospital Corps men. They now sleep wherever a bed can be made available, in basements, tents, over laundry, etc.

Estimated cost..... \$225,000
Extension to subsistence building..... 30,000

Total..... 255,000

Total estimated cost of all hospitals, \$5,345,000.

Mr. VINSON. I should like to read into the record at this time what the last annual report of the Secretary of the Navy says in regard to new hospital construction. I find that—

"The most urgent need of construction exists at Philadelphia. There the hospital buildings are all of the temporary type. They are rapidly deteriorating and can not be used much longer. A tract of land has been offered as a gift by the city of Philadelphia. This offer makes available for hospital construction a tract of 28 acres favorably situated because of its proximity to the navy yard.

"Extensive replacements of war-time hospital buildings at Great Lakes is an urgent necessity. Great Lakes has, in its permanent hospital building, a nucleus for further development, but three-fourths of its activities are carried on in temporary lightly constructed wooden buildings, which are subject to fire hazards. They require a heavy expense for upkeep because of their rapid deterioration.

"At Quantico a 'dispensary and sick quarters' is being used in place of a badly needed naval hospital. Permanent construction is warranted on account of the importance of this large Marine Corps activity.

"More than one-half of the patients in the Washington hospital are housed in temporary buildings. This fact suggests the desirability of replacing some or all of the buildings by permanent structures."

Mr. HALE. The hearings begin on page 1678 and end on page 1760.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. These facts were furnished to me by the Navy Department, and if they are not accurate I am not responsible.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is not the gentleman laying too much emphasis on what the Veterans' Bureau is or is not contemplating? The question pending before the House is a naval hospital to accommodate naval patients, when the facts presented would indicate that that hospital is ready to fall down. What difference does it make whether we replace those hospitals for Veterans' Bureau patients or naval patients? Are not those human beings, entitled to the same consideration? I think the gentleman is emphasizing too much in his remarks the wants of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It would not make any difference whether this hospital were in Philadelphia or elsewhere. The same principle is involved. I shall not oppose any legislation that is needed to take care of veterans, naval patients or otherwise, in any hospital. But when it is shown by all the facts that the Veterans' Bureau is now conducting a building program which will furnish plenty of beds and a surplus to take care of their patients, and the records show that it will take out of the naval hospitals such patients as they can hospitalize, it simply means that we shall have 10,000 vacant beds in naval hospitals in the United States proper if the proposed naval-hospital program I have enumerated from the records is carried out.

Mr. BRITTEN. I do not agree with the gentleman; but let us assume that I do agree with the gentleman; why have the patients in that ramshackle, tumble-down hospital? Do you want them to be placed in a good hospital or not?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Let us use common judgment. When men are enlisted in the Navy they are immediately carried, when ill, to San Diego, Calif., to Philadelphia, or to some other port of the United States where they have a naval hospital. It does not make any difference where the hospitals are. Consequently, if you have a naval hospital at Norfolk, or in Philadelphia, or at San Francisco, or elsewhere, all you have to do is to put the patients on a train and send them to the hospital that is most convenient. You can not send them to the place where they have a preference. In Philadelphia we have a naval hospital that no one has ever claimed to be in a falling-down or rotten condition. That hospital is now being used by about 400 patients from the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. BRITTEN. How old is it?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I should say less than a hundred years old. No one has ever given any information to show that that hospital is not suited to take care of naval patients. I agree with the gentleman that these temporary buildings that exist in other parts of the United States are, some of them, in bad condition; but when this policy or program is put into effect by the Veterans' Bureau, providing additional facilities, then it is very possible that the testimony given by Mr. Madigan, to the effect that they would take care of naval patients, when possible, in veterans' hospitals will be carried out.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman referred to Mr. Madigan, of the Veterans' Bureau, who was a very, very capable witness. As I recall the gentleman's testimony, and I am willing to stake my memory on it against the gentleman's memory, Mr. Madigan said that in every calculation of policy for the Veterans' Bureau in its distribution of patients, it took into account existing hospitals just as though they were Veterans' Bureau hospitals. Is that correct so far?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. No. That is not what he said. His statement will be found on page 964 of the hearings.

Mr. HALE. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I have found in the record of the hearings what I attempted to recall from memory, and I want to read from the testimony of Doctor Skinner, on page 1704:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that, because of the predetermined policy of the Veterans' Bureau, that they will utilize the facilities of other governmental agencies wherever possible, they are not requesting additional appropriations for the construction of Veterans' Bureau hospitals in these very areas?

Doctor SKINNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And as far as you know, that present policy will be adhered to in the future?

Doctor SKINNER. As far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. To utilize other governmental facilities as far as possible?

Doctor SKINNER. Yes, sir. The law provides for that, and we have not seen the necessity in the East at all, although, as you know, there will be one general hospital built somewhere in West Virginia.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I submit to the House that is quite different from the accusation made by the gentleman against me as to the testimony I gave in that particular instance.

Mr. BRITTEN. But it does substantiate what I said?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not dispute the accuracy of the statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HALE], but I say it is the policy of the Veterans' Bureau as has been outlined not only in this statement of Mr. Madigan but in the letter written by General Hines, which was submitted to the Rules Committee a few days ago, that they would first take care of their own patients, and if they did not have sufficient facilities they would put them in other institutions, and I think that is correct. There is no difference of opinion between the Veterans' Bureau and myself.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. PALMER. Here is a statement by Frank L. Pinola, department commander for the State of Pennsylvania, division of the American Legion.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It is not necessary to read that statement, because he is the American Legion representative, and, of course, he is doing what he is told to do. He is not charged with any responsibility with respect to the Navy; he is not charged with any responsibility with respect to the Veterans' Bureau. For that reason I do not consider his testimony is the kind that should be considered by this House, but I offer as a substitute the testimony that is given by the Secretary of the Navy and the head of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. PALMER. He emphasizes the fact that for general purposes this hospital is not right, and there is necessity for its replacement.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Are there not a lot of veterans who can not be hospitalized on account of lack of facilities at the present time?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. No and yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, which?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. There are some hospitals in some States where their capacity has already been used, but when you figure out the total there are more beds than are needed at the present time to take care of the patients.

Mr. ABERNETHY. My observation with respect to the people that I try to hospitalize is that there are not enough beds, and they are using the naval hospitals all over the country, and it strikes me, in view of the fact that they are going to use this hospital, there should be no objection to building it.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman it seems to me that the wise business policy to pursue is to wait until the Veterans' Bureau has completed its present program, which will be within about one year, and then if more hospitals are needed for Navy patients no one would object to this kind of a bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What will the gentleman do with respect to all the patients who may die in the meantime?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. We have them in naval hospitals at the present time. We have 1,300 vacant beds now, not being used in the naval hospitals. Every one of those beds is available for the Veterans' Bureau if they want to use them. When the Veterans' Bureau completes its program, then if there are not sufficient beds to take care of those who should be hospitalized, it is the duty of the gentleman from North Carolina and myself and the other Members, charged with this responsibility, to supply all the money that is needed to take care of that class of patients, and I will vote for such legislation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There are many veterans who do not know to this day that they have the privilege of having hospitalization, and it is getting more that way every day.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman's remarks are not pertinent to this subject.

Mr. BRITEN. It is the duty of some person to let them know about it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not our duty?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes, it is; and I am trying to take care of them in my district, and I hope the gentleman is trying to do so in his own district.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman know that General Hines testified that they will not reach the peak as to hospitalization of veterans until 1944? Do not expect the Veterans' Bureau to look after these men. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there has just been completed and opened a new hospital in St. Louis. They expected this hospital to alleviate the situation there—no beds for at least two years. I will tell the gentleman that in less than one week after the hospital was opened there was not one vacant bed in the new hospital. Therefore, again I say, the Veterans' Bureau has enough to do without looking after the enlisted personnel of the Navy.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. GOLDER. I should like to say that I visit the hospital at Philadelphia Navy Yard quite often. If you would withdraw from the Navy hospital at Philadelphia every veteran case and would not have a single bed occupied by a veteran of the World War, you still would not have a fit place for a naval patient to be placed.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. It is unfortunate that we do not have detailed information that is brought to the House by the various Members. In my capacity all I can depend upon is the statements made by the head of the Veterans' Bureau and by the Secretary of the Navy, and when those statements show that there is a surplus now in both institutions and there is a building program which will provide additional facilities, all that can be done is to add up the number of vacant beds in each of them, add up the number of beds provided by the new appropriation, make the necessary subtractions, and the total can not be disputed by those from the outside. That is what I am doing. As I have stated before, I will never oppose any legislation that is needed, but if this is a proposition to start a building program for naval hospitals in the various States of the United States to take care of Veterans' Bureau patients,

then, it should be approached with a great deal of caution, because, as I view it, each department of the Government should be charged with the responsibility of looking after its own patients. If this bill is enacted into law in its present form and other bills are passed, the ones to which I have called attention, there is not any machinery in any of the legislation that provides for liaison officers; there is not anything that will fasten responsibility on anybody in the Navy or in the Veterans' Bureau, because it is a divided authority. In the Washington hospital bill I attempted to amend the legislation so that we would have liaison officers to take care of those who are brought from the Veterans' Bureau to the naval hospital, because, if you place patients in a military hospital, if they are supervised with naval discipline, sometimes they will not be as happy as they would in a civilian hospital. So I have brought those facts to the attention of the House, not with any spirit of animosity, not with any thought of opposing a bill because it happened to be for a hospital in Pennsylvania, but I am viewing this subject from the standpoint of principle. I would do the same as to any State of the Union if it was shown that the naval-hospital facilities were sufficient for naval patients and that we were going to provide for vacant beds that would not be used.

Mr. GOLDER. I may say there is not a man in this House who does not appreciate the gentleman's sympathy in the cause of disabled soldiers, sailors, and veterans. I say to you, without attempting to dispute the gentleman's figures, because I am not qualified to do so, that if you were to withdraw from the Philadelphia Naval Hospital every veteran of the World War there still would not be a proper place to hospitalize the men who are regularly enlisted in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps to-day. We have a large population of sailors in the navy yard. There must be a proper place for those men when they are ill.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I made a mistake in a statement of figures a moment ago. I find I was in error when I said "12,000." I should have said "4,217" in the naval hospital and "6,200" in the veterans' hospital, which would make "10,400" instead of "12,000."

Mr. GOLDER. The gentleman is confining himself to veteran cases. Now, let me repeat, if the gentleman will pardon the repetition, if you were to withdraw all veterans from the Philadelphia Navy Yard Hospital—and I go down there at least once a month to visit not only veterans but men who are actually enlisted—you still would not have a proper hospital in Philadelphia to take care of the men who are regularly enlisted. I do not want to dispute the gentleman's figures.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman has been very courteous and very kind, but does the gentleman think it is a good policy for the departments of the Government to send their men out or, as generally referred to, farm them out to some other department rather than to take care of them with their own facilities?

Mr. GOLDER. I agree with the gentleman on the proposition of the undesirability of farming men out, as the gentleman terms it, but I think that is a bit beside the question. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, and I say to him that if you would take every veteran away from the Philadelphia hospital—and I have personal knowledge of conditions in that hospital, because I have made a personal investigation—you still would not have a proper place in which to take care of men who are enlisted and who are stationed at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman lays too much stress on the idea of constructing hospitals where you have a disabled veteran. You can not do that. You must take into consideration the fact that disabled veterans can travel 100 miles or so in order to obtain the necessary facilities. I agree with the gentleman that it would be better if we could have a hospital wherever a patient needs that kind of service, in order that he might be close to his family, but that is not possible. Consequently it was my thought that Pennsylvania would be amply cared for because of the fact that there are veterans' hospitals in Maryland, in New York, in Massachusetts, and in West Virginia.

Mr. LEECH. But does the record show a single hospital in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or Delaware which takes care of general medical and surgical cases? The nearest one, as shown by the testimony before our committee, is in Illinois; that there is another hospital being erected in Hartford, Conn.; and that those are the two nearest, serving the same purpose as the Philadelphia Naval Hospital served.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to say in reply that the gentleman's remarks do not refer to the hospitals that are going to be constructed under this \$15,000,000 program.

Mr. LEECH. Does not the gentleman know there is not a single general hospital provided in that bill for the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am not familiar with the kind of structures that are going to be completed and I do not know what kind of hospitals will be constructed, but I do know there will be sufficient facilities within a certain area to take care of the average run of disabled ex-service men. I think you gentlemen lose sight of the main point in this controversy. The main point in this controversy as I see it is to take care of veteran patients and not naval patients. On the other hand, you are attempting to construct hospitals to take care of naval patients when at the present time we have sufficient facilities in the various naval hospitals to take care of naval patients.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I have asked the gentleman to yield to me because I stated a while ago what my recollection was of the testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee and that my recollection differed from that of the gentleman. I also stated that the gentleman himself asked the question in the hearings and received the answer which I said he received. Now, I want to read from page 1008 of the hearings before the Naval Affairs Committee on the Washington hospital.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Before the gentleman does that will the other side give me additional time? They have taken about 30 minutes of my time.

Mr. BRITTEN. Has the gentleman's time expired?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. No; but they have used pretty nearly all of my time.

Mr. BRITTEN. I will say to the gentleman there will be no disposition to curtail the gentleman's time.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think this discussion is beneficial to both sides.

Mr. HALE. I want to read this to the gentleman, because the gentleman thought I made an attack on him. Of course, I did not, and I did not intend to do so. On February 6, 1930, Mr. Madigan, representing the Veterans' Bureau, was before the committee, and the chairman of the committee said this:

Mr. Madigan, will you please tell the committee what you know of the Veterans' Bureau policy, as requested by the committee on yesterday through Mr. MCCLINTIC?

That is, the gentleman on the day before had requested the Veterans' Bureau to state what their policy was, and Mr. Madigan said this:

In certain sections of the country the Veterans' Bureau depends exclusively upon the hospital facilities made available to it by other governmental agencies. This practice has been followed since the Congress made the hospitalization of the veterans of the World War a responsibility of the Federal Government. This policy has not only been successful, but economical as well, and in order that duplication of facilities in a particular State or area might be avoided the bureau in the preparation of its hospital construction programs has always taken cognizance of existing and authorized facilities of other governmental agencies. There is no present intention on the part of the Veterans' Bureau to discontinue such practice.

I simply want to state that answer was made by Mr. Madigan in response to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. But the gentleman put those words in my mouth when I had not used them.

Mr. HALE. I did not intend to do that. I said the gentleman asked the question, and I said the answer of the Veterans' Bureau was given in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Oklahoma. That is all I intended to say.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to say that answer has been supplemented by another answer, dated June 12, 1930, which I will ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD. That answer was made by Gen. Frank T. Hines, and is as follows:

There were no veterans on the waiting list of the Philadelphia office on June 1, 1930, requiring hospitalization for general medical and surgical conditions, which is the type treated principally at the League Island Hospital.

He makes that positive statement, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOLDBER] has brought to my attention certain facts, and I have explained to him that I can only go by information that is furnished to me by these men who are charged with responsibilities of this kind.

Continuing, the second paragraph of the letter states:

The bureau under existing law can not recommend to the Congress any additional hospital facilities at this time unless non-service-connected cases are given a mandatory right to hospitalization, in which event the

existing and authorized Government facilities would undoubtedly have to be materially increased.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In just a moment. I want to say that if you amend the law to cover the statement I have just read from the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, then I am willing to admit that additional hospital facilities will be needed all over the country.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman read the director's letter to the effect that the bureau will not recommend any additional hospital facilities at this time. I will say to the gentleman that this is not an addition to any existing hospital facilities, but is merely a replacement of an old building carrying 600 beds and the new building will provide for a little over 600 beds.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Let us see about that. The letter says, "relative to the necessity for replacing the old naval hospital," so the gentleman is entirely in error. The letter states in the first paragraph, "relative to the necessity for replacing the old naval hospital at League Island, Pa."

Mr. BRITTEN. The letter is not opposed to this bill. There is nothing in the letter that says that.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. If it is not opposed to it, then I have no way of interpreting the English language. I will insert the letter at this point:

JUNE 12, 1930.

HON. BERTRAND H. SNELL,

Chairman Rules Committee,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SNELL: The committee appointed by the Pennsylvania delegation called on me yesterday and requested that I furnish certain information relative to the necessity for replacing the old naval hospital at League Island, Pa., in so far as the needs of the Veterans' Bureau are concerned, and I explained to them our position in the matter.

It develops that of the 405 authorized bureau patients in that hospital on March 31, 1930, some 73 were being treated for disabilities determined to be of service origin, and 332 were admitted for treatment of non-service-connected conditions. The percentage of non-service-connected cases in that hospital for the principal type of disability treated therein—namely, general, medical, and surgical—was slightly in excess of the average for that type in all hospitals throughout the country. It further develops that the bureau has always made extensive use of that hospital principally because it does not operate facilities of the same general type in the State of Pennsylvania. The present bed capacity of the League Island Hospital is understood to be 600, of which approximately two-thirds are now being utilized for bureau patients. During the fiscal year 1929 a daily average of 276 bureau patients were treated therein, and for the first 11 months of the current fiscal year a daily average of 347.

In this same connection, the regional office of this bureau in Philadelphia reports that on June 1, 1930, there were 223 veterans on its rolls awaiting admittance to Government hospitals of which number but 2 required treatment for service-connected conditions. These two cases were suffering from mental diseases for which type of case no beds are available at the League Island Hospital. Further, 210 of the 223 veterans on the waiting list on the above-mentioned date were mental cases, 177 of which were in private or State hospitals awaiting transfer to Government facilities and 33 were not in any hospital. There were no veterans on the waiting list of the Philadelphia office on June 1, 1930, requiring hospitalization for general medical and surgical conditions which is the type treated principally at the League Island Hospital.

It perhaps would be well at this point to comment upon the hospitalization problems confronting the Federal Government under the World War veterans' act of June 7, 1924, as amended. Of the 30,737 veterans admitted to hospitals upon authority of this bureau who were remaining under treatment on May 1, 1930, but approximately 17,000 were being treated for disabilities determined to be of service origin. It is estimated that upon completion of the new construction included in the authorization act of December 23, 1929, there will be available to this bureau in Government hospitals a total of approximately 40,000 beds of which 31,000 will be in veterans' hospitals and the balance in institutions controlled by other Government agencies. It must, therefore, be conceded that with a service-connected load of but 17,000 cases, which incidentally has decreased some 5,000 since December, 1925, and with a present total of 31,378 beds in Government hospitals which will increase to 40,000 within the next two years, that the bureau under existing law can not recommend to the Congress any additional hospital facilities at this time, unless non-service-connected cases are given a mandatory right to hospitalization, in which event the existing and authorized Government facilities would undoubtedly have to be materially increased.

It is understood that the present hospital buildings at League Island are temporary war-time structures and should be replaced on account of their rapid deterioration and the fire hazard they present. If this be so, it would appear that a new naval hospital, with sufficient accommodations at least to meet the requirements of that service, should

be erected at an early date to replace the present structures. As you are undoubtedly aware, the bureau is authorized by law to utilize the now existing and future facilities of other governmental agencies and has done so since that authority was first given it. The bureau is at this time, however, averse to making its requirements the primary consideration in determining the need for a proposed hospital to be operated by another Federal agency. In other words, the bureau is willing to utilize the existing hospital facilities of other governmental agencies to the extent that beds are available and its requirements indicate, and always takes cognizance of the existence of such facilities in determining its own construction programs.

In conclusion it would appear that the matter in question is one for settlement by the Congress and the Navy Department, for, as previously pointed out, the bureau is reluctant to make its requirements the principal consideration in determining the need for a new hospital to be operated by another Federal agency and shall continue, as in the past, to utilize such of the existing facilities as are available beyond the requirements of the agency under whose jurisdiction they are operated.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Director.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I can say to the gentleman that I have a brother who has been lying in this hospital now for about a year. I visit the institution at least once or twice a week, and if the gentleman would go down there and see for himself the conditions there, he would gladly grant any appropriation that might be needed.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want you gentlemen to understand that this letter was addressed to the Hon. BERTRAND H. SNELL, chairman of the Rules Committee, in opposition, as I construe it, to a request for a special rule on this bill. All I can say to you is that the facts as furnished by the Navy Department and the Veterans' Bureau show that you have not got a very good case. I want you gentlemen to understand that there is nothing personal in this, and if the facts given to me by the Veterans' Bureau and the Navy Department are wrong, then you may be entitled to a hospital.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If the gentleman will permit further, I can say to the gentleman that 80 per cent of the buildings at League Island are time buildings, and, as the chairman of the committee has stated, this is simply a replacement.

In that connection I invite the gentleman's attention to the statement of Rear Admiral Julian L. Latimer, the commandant of the navy yard at Philadelphia:

I want to point out to the committee the urgent need for this construction at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The hospital buildings are of a temporary character. Some of the members of the committee have seen these buildings and know what their condition is. All of them are buildings of the most highly inflammable type, being of wooden construction on wooden laths; interior laths on the interior walls are also of wood. The buildings are covered by a ready-roofing material that is highly inflammable. The one-fifth of these buildings that are not of stucco construction are weatherboarded. They have been standing there for many years and are thoroughly dried out. One building is of three stories, but on account of the fire hazard we do not dare to quarter anyone on the third floor because they would not have a chance to get out in case of fire. The buildings have deteriorated badly. They were originally built on wood piling which has rotted out and short concrete piles have been put in their place. The buildings rest about 2 or 2½ feet above the ground and the ground is moist. Studding and beams are in advanced stage of deterioration and are being constantly replaced. The cost of the building was \$888,000 and in the last five and a half years \$243,000 has been spent in maintenance, upkeep, and repairs. The amount to be expended yearly for that purpose will not decrease.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Gentlemen, it is not my desire to take up so much time. I have tried as courteously as I know how to answer all the questions that have been propounded. I do not have any way to obtain facts other than from the testimony and from the letters that are written to me by the heads of the various departments. It was brought out in the hearings that if the Navy hospitals did not have to take care of veteran patients they would not need the present number of physicians in the department. You will find there are 296 physicians assigned to hospitals, 249 ashore, and the balance are assigned with the fleet. If this policy is allowed to continue, if this program is carried out and naval hospitals are to be constructed throughout the Nation, then it simply means a very large increased personnel both in the Navy and the Veterans' Bureau. When you bring about this increased personnel there is not a word of legislation that provides for any liaison officers, and the responsibility is not shouldered by any one

branch of the Government when it comes to taking care of these patients.

Mr. WATRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. WATRES. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. The chairman of the committee has stated that this is a replacement and not new construction. I want to ask the gentleman further if the gentleman has himself had an opportunity to see this hospital which is to be replaced?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am pleased to answer the gentleman. No member of the committee during the present session, other than perhaps those who reside in this State, has been able to view the Philadelphia facilities. As I have explained quite in detail, all of the information I have here is that which has been brought to me from the Veterans' Bureau, from the Secretary of the Navy, and from the witnesses who testified before us at the hearings. Therefore when it is shown that we will have when they spend this \$15,000,000 about 6,000 vacant beds, I doubt the advisability of entering upon a program which would cause the Navy to take care of Veterans' Bureau patients to the extent that a lot of personnel would be authorized that would not be needed when the Veterans' Bureau had withdrawn their patients and put them in their own hospitals.

Mr. WATRES. I appreciate what the gentleman says, but I think if he were familiar with the conditions there he would agree with those who have seen the actual situation in this hospital that this is neither a suitable nor a safe place to keep patients, whether they are patients of the Veterans' Bureau or patients of the Navy, especially in view of the fact that this is to be simply a replacement.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRUMM. I understood the gentleman to say that according to the head of the Veterans' Bureau there is enough room for the patients of the Veterans' Bureau, and according to the statements of the Navy there are enough beds for the naval patients. In the first place, does not the gentleman realize that this very hospital that we are asking to have replaced is included in that statement? And does not the gentleman realize that some of these veterans' cases are naval cases, as well as Army cases, and the Navy should take care of its own men?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I have always been in favor of each branch of the Government providing hospitals for its own patients.

Mr. BRUMM. They are doing it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. They are as far as possible at the present time, but you understand, to be perfectly fair, the veterans' hospital facilities at the present time are not sufficient, and the overplus is being taken to the naval hospitals.

Mr. BRUMM. Where they are much better taken care of.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I can not agree with the gentleman in that.

Mr. BRUMM. That can be easily established.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is a matter of opinion that comes from different sources.

Mr. BRUMM. The gentleman stated that it makes no difference as to whether a man gets on a train and has to go for miles—how would the gentleman like to have his own son or brother a case of neuropsychosis, a case like I have in my district now, notwithstanding what General Hines or anyone else says—how would he like to have him travel for hundreds of miles from the State of Pennsylvania, from a district where there are 8,000,000 people, to a smaller State for hospitalization?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman is contending that they ought to have a hospital in every county in Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRUMM. Oh, no; I do not; but I want it in a section where there are 8,000,000 people.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. As I say, it is not possible to construct hospitals wherever there are veteran patients, but it would please me if they could in order that patients might be close to their families.

Mr. BRUMM. The gentleman would not say that there ought to be a hospital in Oklahoma to take care of patients in Pennsylvania. That great State has hundreds of patients waiting for hospitalization.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. That is not in accordance with the statement made by General Hines. General Hines said in this letter:

It is estimated that upon completion of the new construction included in the authorization act of December 23, 1929, there will be available to this bureau in Government hospitals a total of approximately 40,000 beds of which 31,000 will be in veterans' hospitals and the balance in institutions controlled by other Government agencies. It must, therefore, be conceded that with a service-connected load of

but 17,000 cases, which incidentally has decreased some 5,000 since December, 1925, and with a present total of 31,378 beds in Government hospitals which will increase to 40,000 within the next two years, that the bureau under existing law can not recommend to the Congress any additional hospital facilities at this time, unless nonservice-connected cases are given a mandatory right to hospitalization, in which event the existing and authorized Government facilities would undoubtedly have to be materially increased.

Mr. BRUMM. What does the gentleman know about Pennsylvania, that is the whole thing? We are killing two birds with one stone, making replacements in an excellent institution for the Navy in Pennsylvania and taking care of the surplus veterans that we have notwithstanding what anybody says.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The gentleman confuses the question to this extent. The Navy should hospitalize naval patients, and they should not be charged with the responsibility of hospitalizing veterans' patients. Now there is no answer to that question.

Mr. BRUMM. I think there is.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. The responsibility if there should be a failure should fall upon the Veterans' Bureau, because they are charged with the responsibility, and not on the Navy. We are not justified in building up a lot of naval hospitals for patients that come from some other branch of the Government. I object to the policy of providing a lot of hospitals when you know that you are not going to have naval patients to put in such hospitals.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I know a demented case where the soldier is waiting for hospitalization. Would the gentleman want that case to remain in a city hospital?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to say to the gentlemen that I think the only way to solve this problem is to require the Veterans' Bureau to furnish all the facilities needed for veteran patients. When you do this, I shall vote for any kind of a program that will bring that about, but I do not like the policy of one branch of the Government constructing a lot of hospitals when they know beforehand that they are not going to fill them with patients that come from their own service. At the present time you have nearly 1,300 vacant beds in naval hospitals. This situation does not need any further explanation. I have covered this case from the standpoint of the records, and the records, as furnished to me—and I do not vouch for their accuracy—the records show that when the Veterans' Bureau completes its program we will have sufficient facilities to take care of all the veteran patients in veterans' hospitals. If that is true, then 2,900 will be withdrawn from the naval hospitals, and when you withdraw 2,900 veteran patients from the naval hospitals you will have a surplus of about four or five thousand beds, without any patients to put in them.

Gentlemen, you overlook another fact. Naval patients are brought from every State in the Union. There is not that same degree of home fellowship and home loyalty that would exist among veteran patients, because a man in the Navy when he leaves one place is liable to perform service in Florida, Illinois, or California, consequently, when you have sufficient naval hospitals and beds, you can transfer naval patients back and forth without any fear of ever bringing about a condition that would work a hardship on the individual. I am trying to differentiate between the two kinds of patients and the two kinds of service, with the hope that the House will look at this from a business standpoint, and cause the Veterans' Bureau to hospitalize its patients and the Navy Department to hospitalize its patients, and then there will not be this mix up because of this dual authority or lack of proper coordination which is necessary to bring about the greatest efficiency.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. If I had known the gentleman's attitude on this project in Philadelphia, I would have asked him to come to Philadelphia and see for himself the condition of the hospital to-day. I can assure the gentleman that if he had, he would have been its strongest advocate.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. I have the highest regard for his integrity and for that of every Member of the Pennsylvania delegation. In fact, I wish it was so that I did not feel it my duty to oppose this legislation. It is not because it is Pennsylvania, because if there is one State that I should be proud of it is Pennsylvania. I opposed this bill in the committee, and I opposed it at other stages when it came up for consideration on one ground solely, and that is that it is not warranted by the record furnished by the Navy Department and by the Veterans' Bureau. If the Secretary of the Navy had indorsed it, or if the Budget Bureau had favored it, or if General Hines was in favor of such a measure, then there might be some grounds to say that my information is incorrect. I do not intend to proceed with dilatory tactics. I

am conscious of the fact I am in the minority. It is your proposition to do with as you please. I have done my duty, and I thank you for your indulgence.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, as I view the situation relative to hospital facilities for disabled veterans in the State of Pennsylvania, any step that can be taken to enlarge those now presently available should be taken. My interest in the replacement of the naval hospital in Philadelphia by a new structure has been twofold. First, I desire to see proper and adequate facilities available there for the men of the regular Navy. Secondly, I want to have available to veterans entitled to hospital treatment the surplus facilities in the institution under better conditions than those now existing.

I have the greatest concern over the hospitalization of veterans located in Pennsylvania. The gravity of this situation has been emphasized by the officials and spokesmen of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion. These officials have appeared before congressional committees seeking an increase in the facilities available. Their statements have been positive. Their efforts have covered a long period. My interest has been continuous and will be until satisfactory conditions shall have been established.

Without a doubt Pennsylvania veterans in need of hospitalization are not faring nearly so well as veterans from Illinois, Massachusetts, and other States, where hospital facilities for their treatment exist within the confines of their respective native States. The officials of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion have made comprehensive surveys, the figures of which are not disputed, and which demonstrate conclusively that just short of 50 per cent of Pennsylvania's World War veterans undergoing hospital treatment, as recently as the middle of April of this year, were hospitalized outside of their home State.

This is the condition which should be remedied. This is the situation with which the Congress should deal. I know that the entire membership of the Pennsylvania delegation in this House is deeply concerned regarding it, and is working diligently to correct the state of affairs in which our Pennsylvania veterans find themselves.

The department executive committee of the Pennsylvania Department of the American Legion, under date of May 14, 1930, through the department adjutant, James J. Deighan, transmitted to me the following resolution:

Resolution

Whereas it is such an evident fact from reports that have been gathered from hospitals throughout the State that there are over 500 disabled veterans who are unable to receive hospitalization in Veterans' Bureau or Federal hospitals, and who are now confined to county homes and hospitals: Be it

Resolved, That we in executive session do indorse in its entirety the program of the State commander, State officers, and the committee of disabled soldiers for an increase in hospital facilities in the State, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators: And be it further

Resolved, That we do all in our power to secure an increase in hospital facilities, namely, a 500-bed tubercular hospital in north central part of Pennsylvania, an increase in Coatesville mental hospital from 481 to 1,250 beds, a new naval hospital at Philadelphia, additional beds at Aspinwall Hospital, and a diagnostic center in Hospital No. 49, Philadelphia.

This, Mr. Chairman, represents the program to which the veterans of the World War in Pennsylvania stand committed. It represents the program which I indorse. It represents the program which I earnestly and sincerely desire the Congress of the United States to adopt and prosecute to a satisfactory conclusion as expeditiously as possible.

It is a program based on careful study and, as I regard it, one that is in every way worthy of our undivided support. The work back of its preparation has been painstaking. There can be no doubt that additional hospital facilities for veterans are needed in Pennsylvania. These men by the very nature of their ailments should all be treated in Government hospitals and within the confines of their own State. Prevailing conditions when they undergo treatment in Federal, State, and locally, and privately conducted institutions constitute a state of affairs that should be promptly terminated.

The Pennsylvania department of the American Legion on April 16, 1930, conducted a survey of all institutions within the State to ascertain definitely the number of veterans being hospitalized in all hospitals at that time. Likewise the officials of the Legion ascertained the number of Pennsylvanians being hospitalized outside of the State. And it must be borne in mind that the figures that resulted therefrom do not by any means represent the total number of veterans in need of hospital treatment and entitled to it, for there are hundreds who can not be

placed in the institutions now available and who can not for many reasons go to institutions away from Pennsylvania where they might obtain treatment.

At this point I desire to insert as a part of my remarks the tabulated report of the survey by the Pennsylvania legionnaires to which I have referred, and which is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 16, 1930.

Recapitulation of survey of State, county, private, and Government hospitals of Pennsylvania men

	Hospitalized in State of Pennsylvania	Hospitalized outside of State of Pennsylvania	Total
NEUROPSYCHIATRIC CASES			
U. S. Veterans' hospital	368	648	1,016
Other Government hospitals		137	137
State, county, and private hospitals	380		380
Total	748	785	1,533
TUBERCULOSIS CASES			
U. S. Veterans' hospital	160	170	330
State, county, and private hospitals	150		150
Total	310	170	480
Grand total			2,013

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Report of Pennsylvania men hospitalized in State, county, and private institutions in Pennsylvania

N. P. CASES—STATE INSTITUTIONS

Allentown State Hospital, Allentown, Pa.	38
Danville State Hospital, Danville, Pa.	20
Farview State Hospital, Waymart Post Office, Wayne County, Pa.	34
Harrisburg State Hospital, Harrisburg, Pa.	31
Norristown State Hospital, Norristown, Pa.	34
Warren State Hospital, Warren, Pa.	13
Dixmont Hospital, Dixmont, Allegheny County, Pa.	8
Wernersville State Hospital, Wernersville, Pa.	1
Torrance State Hospital, Torrance Post Office, Westmoreland County, Pa.	6

COUNTY INSTITUTIONS

Allegheny County Hospital for Mental Diseases, Woodville, Pa.	15
Pittsburgh City Home and Hospital, Mayview, Pa.	43
Blair County Hospital, Hollidaysburg, Pa.	4
Chester County Hospital, Embreeville, Pa.	1
Blakely Home, Olyphant, Lackawanna County, Pa.	1
Ransom Hospital, Ransom, Pa.	7
Lancaster County Hospital, Lancaster, Pa.	8
Mercer County Hospital, Mercer, Pa.	2
Philadelphia County Hospital for Mental Diseases, Byberry, Philadelphia, Pa.	53
Schuylkill County Hospital, Schuylkill Haven, Pa.	7
Somerset County Hospital, Somerset, Pa.	5
Retreat Hospital, Retreat, Luzerne County, Pa.	25
Hillside Home, Clarke's Summit, Lackawanna County, Pa.	13

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Friends Hospital, Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa.	4
Kenwood Sanatorium, Chestnut Hill, Pa.	1
Pennsylvania Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.	1
St. Francis Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa.	5

Total State, county, and private institutions..... 380

T. B. CASES, STATE INSTITUTIONS

State T. B. Hospital, Cresson, Pa.	10
State T. B. Hospital, Hamburg, Pa.	20
State T. B. Hospital, Mont Alto, Pa.	24

COUNTY INSTITUTIONS

Beaver County T. B. Hospital, Monaca, Pa.	5
Allegheny County T. B. Sanatorium, Woodville, Pa.	2

PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Devitt's Camp for Treatment of T. B., Allenwood, Pa.	15
Rush Hospital, Malvern, Pa.	1
Pittsburgh City Home and Hospital, Mayview, Pa.	8
White Haven Sanatorium, White Haven, Pa.	17
Eagleview Sanatorium for Consumptives, Eagleview, Pa.	4
Rossmore Sanatorium, Lancaster, Pa.	2
Tuberculosis department Philadelphia General Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.	34
Berks County T. B. Sanatorium, box 943, Reading, Pa.	5
West Mountain Sanatorium, Scranton, Pa.	3

Total, State, county, and private institutions..... 150

Report of Pennsylvania men hospitalized in United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals in Pennsylvania—Neuropsychiatric cases

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 49, Philadelphia, Pa.	368
--	-----

Report of Pennsylvania men hospitalized in United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals outside of Pennsylvania

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 62, Augusta, Ga.	2
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 81, Bronx, N. Y.	8
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 100, Camp Custer, Mich.	7
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 97, Chillicothe, Ohio.	72

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 74, Gulfport, Miss.	1
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 57, Knoxville, Iowa.	1
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 95, Northampton, Mass.	2
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 108, Northport, Long Island, N. Y.	3
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 105, North Chicago, Ill.	1
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 42, Perry Point, Md.	537
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 86, Sheridan, Wyo.	8
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 91, Tuskegee, Ala.	4
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 101, St. Cloud, Minn.	2

Total..... 648

Other Government hospitals:

Marion National Sanatorium, Marion, Ind.	76
St. Elizabeths, Washington, D. C.	61

Total..... 137

Total outside State..... 785

Report of Pennsylvania men hospitalized in United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals in Pennsylvania—Tuberculosis cases

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 103, Aspinwall, Pa.	160
--	-----

Report of Pennsylvania men hospitalized in United States Veterans' Bureau hospitals outside of Pennsylvania

United States Veterans' Hospital No. 98, Castle Point, N. Y.	50
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 80, Fort Lyon, Colo.	2
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 55, Fort Bayard, N. Mex.	27
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 93, Legion, Tex.	3
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 102, Livermore, Calif.	1
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 79, Outwood, Ky.	4
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 96, Sunmount, N. Y.	7
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 104, San Fernando, Calif.	14
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 51, Tucson, Ariz.	8
United States Veterans' Hospital, Johnson City, Tenn.	23
United States Veterans' Hospital No. 60, Oteen, N. C.	31

Total..... 170

Mr. Chairman, every effort should be made to have the Congress act on this bill to authorize the construction of a new naval hospital in Philadelphia during the present session. It should not be permitted to lag, and it is also imperative that a sufficient appropriation to enable the prompt beginning of construction work should be approved at this session.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC], who has preceded me, spoke at some length of a letter from General Hines written to the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I can readily understand why General Hines, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, would not interfere with the administration of the Navy Department by recommending the construction of a naval hospital. In fact, he himself told me that he could not do that. Having said that, I am also thoroughly convinced that he would not interfere with the department in the opposite way by recommending that a naval hospital should not be constructed. I shall wait for the full text of the letter to show what I have said.

The Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report on new hospital construction, said:

The most urgent need of construction exists at Philadelphia. There the hospital buildings are all of the temporary type. They are rapidly deteriorating and can not be used much longer. A tract of land has been offered as a gift by the city of Philadelphia. This offer makes available for hospital construction a tract of 28 acres favorably situated because of its proximity to the navy yard.

I repeat the first clause:

The most urgent need of construction exists at Philadelphia.

The gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCLINTIC], said that if the Secretary of the Navy recommended it, he would support the bill. I ask the gentleman now to keep his promise.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite catch what the gentleman said. Will he repeat it?

Mr. TEMPLE. The gentleman from Oklahoma said a while ago that if the Secretary of the Navy favored this hospital he would support the bill.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not think I made it in quite that language.

Mr. TEMPLE. Probably not in that language, but in language to that effect.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I think I said that if General Hines and the Budget Bureau and the Secretary of the Navy had favored it, I would have favored the bill.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think the gentleman is qualifying what he did say. I call the gentleman's attention now to what is said by Rear Admiral Julian L. Latimer, the commandant of the navy yard at Philadelphia:

I want to point out to the committee the urgent need for this construction at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The hospital buildings are of a temporary character. Some of the members of the committee have seen these buildings and know what their condition is. All of them are

buildings of the most highly inflammable type, being of wooden construction throughout. Over four-fifths of them are all stucco construction on wooden laths; interior laths on the interior walls are also of wood. The buildings are covered by a ready-roofing material that is highly inflammable. The one-fifth of these buildings that are not of stucco construction are weatherboarded. They have been standing there for many years and are thoroughly dried out. One building is of three stories, but on account of the fire hazard we do not dare to quarter anyone on the third floor because they would not have a chance to get out in case of fire.

I think nothing need be added to the testimony of these two witnesses to show that the reconstruction of this hospital is needed, but I wish to turn for a moment before I sit down to one other point.

The gentleman from Oklahoma says that each service of the Government should confine its hospital work to its own people; that naval hospitals should receive no patients but those who are of the commissioned or enlisted personnel of the Navy, and that Veterans' Bureau patients should not be treated except in Veterans' Bureau hospitals.

That is a policy that the Government of the United States has not adopted. We use the beds wherever they may be found for the men who need them. As to the statement that nobody is awaiting hospitalization in Pennsylvania, that applies to the men who demand hospitalization under their right. Under the law a man whose disability is not of service origin may be hospitalized if beds are available. If a man's disabilities are of service origin, he can demand hospitalization. It may be true that no one whose disabilities are of service origin is waiting for hospitalization. If General Hines says so, I have no doubt he is supported by the records of the Veterans' Bureau, but it is also true that disabled veterans whose disabilities are not proved to be of service origin are waiting for hospitalization and there are not enough beds for them. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MENGES].

Mr. MENGES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MENGES. Mr. Chairman, this legislation appeals to me not because it is to benefit Pennsylvania, while whatever may be beneficial to that State always elicits my keenest interest; it appeals to me because it provides hospitalization within the limits of the State which has furnished more soldiers for the World War than any other State of this Union, and which up to this time has had only infinitesimal hospital facilities in comparison to what the State has done to win the war. In my own congressional district there are now on the waiting list a considerable number of ill World War veterans entitled to hospitalization for whom no beds are available, some of whom, as has happened in the past, may pass away before such essential facilities for their recovery will become available. It is to be deplored that the vacant beds in local and State hospitals supported by the public can not now be utilized for the hospitalization of World War veterans and these institutions be made self-sustaining, or, if not, extend their charity to those who have sacrificed by giving their full measure of devotion to their country as well as to their local community.

Mr. MAGRADY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGRADY. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I desire to add my voice in these proceedings considering the naval hospital bill, as well as my vote in support of such a worthy and much-needed project at Philadelphia. Pennsylvania's multitude of ex-service men have a right to the best medical and surgical treatment the Government can give. They surely are entitled to the earliest consideration that can be given to their suffering, injured comrades. The entire Pennsylvania delegation of Representatives in Congress as a unit join in declaring that the construction of such a hospital at this great medical center of the world will serve the highest interests of those entitled to admission and treatment at the earliest moment, as well as later, as developments may indicate and require. Here the population suggests that large number of veterans may be closer to the place where they can be conveniently admitted for treatment without traveling long, tiresome, and hurtful journeys in their suffering condition.

The present hospital edifice is of such construction and in such poor condition that the repair and upkeep necessary make maintenance more costly than a proper new structure will be. The crying need of better facilities rightfully due the veterans is glaringly shown by the present poor condition of the buildings

in use. Philadelphia is one of the world's great medical centers. Here renowned specialists and colleges may be drawn upon for highest surgical and medical skill, to the advantage of needy veterans, whether they be of the Navy or Army, or those who have been injured in the World War.

The provisions of this bill will fit nicely into the great national plan for erection of hospitals to care for disabled veterans regardless of what locality they may come from.

I favor having beds not in use, rather than be obliged to turn a veteran aside and be unable to admit him for treatment. I am for the bill favoring the erection of the hospital at Philadelphia Navy Yard without delay.

Mr. MCCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, has the Chair recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma in his request that all Members may have leave to extend?

The CHAIRMAN. No; not in committee.

Mr. GOLDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the extreme courtesy he has shown in yielding time to the Members from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LEECH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEECH. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the bill now under consideration is one authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct a new hospital at the navy yard at League Island in Philadelphia.

In 1916 the Secretary created the board known as the Board for the Development of Navy Yard Plans, which has continued to date. It includes 14 members, representatives of the Office of the Navy Yard Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, each bureau of the Navy Department, and Headquarters of the United States Marine Corps. The duties of this board as prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy are:

The board shall prepare for each of the stations listed in the shore establishment project a comprehensive plan of development embodying the requirements of the shore establishment project and the essential features of an ideal layout so far as may be practicable for the base under consideration. In preparing such plans due consideration shall be given to existing facilities and present arrangement so that the complete project may be attained with a minimum expenditure.

In preparing the program called for by its precept the board has confined itself to developments needed at present under peace time and those which would be needed in war-time expansion but only such as can not be quickly extemporized.

In the proposed program there is projected a hospital at the Philadelphia Navy Yard of 500-bed capacity.

The Secretary of the Navy in his annual report for 1929, under the heading New Hospital Construction, makes the following statement:

The most urgent need of construction exists at Philadelphia. There the hospital buildings are all of the temporary type. They are rapidly deteriorating and can not be used much longer. A tract of land has been offered as a gift by the city of Philadelphia. This offer makes available for hospital construction a tract of 28 acres favorably situated because of its proximity to the navy yard.

Admiral Riggs, Surgeon General of the Navy, at the hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs, said:

The present physical condition of the structures forming the naval hospital, Philadelphia, is very unsatisfactory. The buildings were constructed as an emergency, war-time measure and have reached already a state of considerable deterioration. Naturally, they present a certain fire hazard. Also, the plan on which the hospital was constructed was necessarily of an emergency nature, and it does not permit of full efficiency in treatment and administration. It is considered that the need for a new naval hospital at Philadelphia is an urgent one.

Rear Admiral Latimer, commandant of the navy yard at Philadelphia, at the same hearing, in reference to this hospital proposition said:

I want to point out to the committee the urgent need for this construction at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The hospital buildings are of a temporary character. Some of the members of the committee have seen these buildings and know what their condition is. All of them are buildings of the most highly inflammable type, being of wooden con-

struction on wooden laths; interior laths on the interior walls are also of wood. The buildings are covered by a ready-roofing material that is highly inflammable. The one-fifth of these buildings that are not of stucco construction are weatherboarded. They have been standing there for many years and are thoroughly dried out. One building is of three stories, but on account of the fire hazard we do not dare to quarter anyone on the third floor because they would not have a chance to get out in case of fire. The buildings have deteriorated badly. They were originally built on wood piling which has rotted out and short concrete piles have been put in their place. The buildings rest about 2 or 2½ feet above the ground and the ground is moist. Studding and beams are in advanced stage of deterioration and are being constantly replaced. The cost of the building was \$888,000 and in the last five and a half years \$243,000 has been spent in maintenance, upkeep, and repairs. The amount to be expended yearly for that purpose will not decrease.

Admiral McNamee, United States Navy, Office of Naval Operations, said at the same hearing, while engaged in a colloquy with Mr. Britten, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee:

The CHAIRMAN. Before you read your final statement there concerning the location, let me ask you this question: You say the question of erecting a hospital at Philadelphia has been under your observation for five or six years?

Admiral McNamee. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it considered a very urgent necessity over there?

Admiral McNamee. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been?

Admiral McNamee. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Always, in the past?

Admiral McNamee. Yes, sir.

In view of the fact that under the policy of the Government at this time the Veterans' Bureau in its hospitalization program uses the facilities of the hospitals operated by the United States Navy, as well as those of the Army and the Public Health Service, the director of the bureau was requested to give his views on this legislation. In response to this request, Mr. Paul Madigan, Chief of the Evaluation Division of the Veterans' Bureau, and Doctor Skinner, Chief of the Regional Office Medical Service, Veterans' Bureau, both testified before the Naval Affairs Committee at the hearings on this bill. Mr. Madigan stated that the nearest Veterans' Bureau hospital to Philadelphia serving general medical and surgical cases now in operation was the Edward Hines Veterans' Bureau Hospital in Illinois, but that the bureau now had under construction, and hoped to complete this year, such a hospital at Hartford, Conn., with facilities for about 200 patients.

It was testified at the hearing that the League Island Hospital at Philadelphia is the only hospital serving the general medical and surgical cases of veterans in Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and Maryland. Doctor Skinner said that in the territory mentioned there was a shortage of beds for the treatment of this class of veterans, and that the Veterans' Bureau needed for patients in the Philadelphia Hospital 450 beds, and that they had enough on their waiting list then to use that number of beds, and, from his experience during the past year, the need would increase—this without any extension of legislation. The testimony of these two gentlemen before this committee showed that the cost of maintenance and care of the general medical cases of the Veterans' Bureau was less in the Navy hospitals than in the veterans' hospitals. The construction of a hospital at the navy yard, Philadelphia, to provide space sufficient to care for veteran patients as well as Navy patients is an economic advantage both to the Veterans' Bureau and to the Navy.

Figures presented to the committee show a considerable saving in money to the Federal Treasury by this dual method of caring for patients in the naval hospital. The testimony indicates that if Veterans' Bureau patients had not been hospitalized there the treatment of 135 naval patients there, at an average cost of \$3.72 per day, would have meant a total cost of \$183,623.28. Under the dual arrangements, with treatment of Veterans' Bureau patients, the actual cost to the Navy for these 135 patients was \$152,274.31, showing a saving of \$31,348.97. This was accomplished by cutting down the overhead.

It was further established that the average cost for operating Veterans' Bureau hospitals of general medical type, scattered throughout the United States, is about \$4.55 per diem, and that the general average cost for the total number of their patients of all classes was \$4.01 per diem. At the Philadelphia Naval Hospital last year there were 100,806 sick days paid for by the Veterans' Bureau, which at the lower average of \$4.01 per diem, if these patients had been hospitalized elsewhere, would have amounted to \$404,232.06, whereas the actual cost at this hos-

pital, including the personnel, was \$318,618.14, showing an estimated saving to the Veterans' Bureau of \$85,613.92 in one year.

These two items, totaling \$116,962.79, show an astounding saving to the Federal Treasury, and speak louder than words as to the advisability of continuing the policy of treatment of Veterans' Bureau and naval patients at this naval hospital.

Our disabled war veterans express their preference for being sent to the naval hospital for treatment, being of the opinion that the medical equipment and personnel are of a superior type to that found in other centers. Veterans' Bureau officials, American Legion posts, and other ex-service men's organizations speak in highest terms of the excellent treatment accorded the disabled at this hospital, and in order that they may continue to receive the advantage of the best possible medical and surgical treatment have urged that adequate and ample facilities be provided to continue this arrangement permanently.

Although neither Congress nor the Veterans' Bureau in its allocation of funds for veterans' hospitals has ever recognized State lines, and this is fortunate. A study of the situation discloses that although Pennsylvania furnished 450,000 men for the service of our country during the World War, one-tenth of the entire Army personnel in the service, its disabled soldiers are hospitalized to a much greater extent outside the confines of that Commonwealth than those of any other State in its class. Some months ago the recognized organizations of World War veterans in Pennsylvania, through their officials, presented to the members of our delegation in the House certain figures purporting to show the urgent need of further hospital facilities for veterans in that State. The statements made by these officials were not in accord with the records disclosed by the Veterans' Bureau in reference to the number of veterans' cases in that State awaiting hospitalization, and without Government facilities to serve them.

It can, of course, be said that Acting Secretary of the Navy Jahncke recommended against the immediate passage of this legislation, as it can also be said that the Veterans' Bureau has not recommended the immediate passage of the bill. However, the opposition of the Acting Secretary of the Navy is taken solely from the point of view of the Navy, without reference to the position of the Veterans' Bureau in the use of the proposed facilities, and the opposition of the Veterans' Bureau must be considered in the light of the fact that they can never, of course, recommend any naval construction. Our difficulty is this, that although these facilities will be jointly used by the Navy and the Veterans' Bureau, neither department can consider the needs of the other in recommending necessary legislation, and the only body to coordinate the needs of the veterans in this connection is the Congress of the United States.

The priority construction list made up by the Secretary of the Navy shows clearly by the testimony of Admiral McNamee, and others, that the hospital needs of the Navy are classed as inferior to other needs of that department. The proposed new Navy hospital at Philadelphia has been recommended as an urgent necessity for some years, but the Navy Department on its priority list of construction continually recommends for earlier attention officers' quarters, gymnasium and welfare buildings, and other such improvements. In fact, the new Navy hospital at Washington, D. C., which bill passed the House last week, was not on the priority list at all. It is submitted, however, that the people of the United States, whom we represent, believe that no development or construction should have priority over the provision of proper hospital facilities for the care of both our service and our ex-service men and women, and that this legislation should have the approval of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to construct hospital buildings, and to provide equipment, accessories, utilities, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, on land already acquired or hereby authorized to be acquired therefor by purchase, gift, or otherwise, at or in the vicinity of the navy yard, Philadelphia, Pa., subject to appropriation hereafter made; the land, if purchased, to cost not in excess of \$200,000; and the buildings, equipment, accessories, utilities, and appurtenances to cost not in excess of \$3,000,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "of the navy yard."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "of the navy yard."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment solely for the purpose of giving the committee an opportunity to express itself on the question of the site of this hospital.

What I am seeking to do is to leave the question of the location of the hospital entirely in the hands of the Secretary. The responsibility is all his, and not ours. We have not the facilities necessary to determine the best place at which to locate the hospital. Our legislative function ends after we authorize the appropriation.

I have received information to the effect that there is a plan on foot in Philadelphia to place this hospital on a particular site in order to make the Government do the drainage. We have had some experience of that kind in the past.

Mr. BRITTEN. I think the gentleman's amendment is a very good one.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let the gentleman wait. I may not be so strong for my own amendment if the gentleman from Illinois will accept it. [Laughter.]

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, we desire to have this hospital located on a proper site in a desirable surrounding. An offer has been made, I am informed, to locate it somewhere where the Navy Department does not want it. We should not locate a hospital near a railroad yard or in a swamp. We should provide that the Secretary may accept the gift of a site if he deems the location desirable in every sense of the needs of a hospital. My amendment is intended to give the Secretary greater discretion so that he can place the hospital anywhere in the vicinity of Philadelphia. It would not limit him to placing it in the vicinity of any one point. It will give the Secretary the widest discretion, and surely with such latitude the hospital should be located properly in the right kind of surroundings, and in a locality proper for hospital purposes.

Mr. COYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, although I do not propose to oppose it.

There is one observation I want to make, and I think you are entitled to it before you pass this bill. I think your temper is entirely favorable to passing the bill, and therefore I do not want to delay you a moment. There is a little conflict of priority between two different departments; not a conflict of needs. The Navy Department wants this hospital for naval men. The Veterans' Bureau needs it for Veterans' Bureau patients. The Navy did not put it at the top of the list, but the Veterans' Bureau insists that the need exists. The conflict in priorities can be reconciled by this House when you vote for the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, while I was a member of the subcommittee on hospitals, of the World War Veterans' Committee, I acquired an interest in the general subject which warrants me in calling to the attention of the House certain facts about the hospital situation throughout the country that greatly surprised me, and I think will surprise the House.

I have in my hand the 1930 presentation of hospital statistics by the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, from which I find that last year the rate of occupancy, or proportion of beds constantly in use in hospitals in the United States, was 65.5 per cent—the lowest since the annual census of hospitals was begun nine years ago.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman give the date of the report?

Mr. LUCE. Yes. This is dated March 29, 1930. Less than two-thirds of the hospital beds of the United States are now occupied. Less than two-thirds.

It is a matter of common knowledge that unless the usual hospital has a bed occupancy of from 80 to 85 per cent, it is not being conducted to economic advantage. As a matter of fact, we have 20 per cent less occupancy of hospital beds in this country than is economical.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman find it to be the fact that a great many veterans do not know they are entitled to hospital advantages?

Mr. LUCE. I am not speaking of veterans at all. I am talking about hospital occupancy of all of the hospitals of the United States, and calling attention to the fact that, taking into consideration every hospital of every kind in the country, qualified for registration, less than two-thirds of the beds are occupied. For instance, in the particular case under discussion, to illustrate the situation, I find that in the naval hospital at Philadelphia last year, with 700 beds, the average number of patients was 411. I find in the case of a suburb of Boston, the city of

Chelsea, where there is a naval hospital with 614 beds, only 350 were occupied on the average. In the District of Columbia, where there is in progress a program for the construction of more naval hospital facilities, the figures show that last year in the Naval Hospital there were 484 beds and on the average only 368 occupied.

The trouble with the hospital situation is that we are overbuilding in the matter of hospitals in some parts of the country and not building enough in others. Here is a really alarming statement, that of the counties of the United States, while 1,794 have hospitals, there are 1,282 without a hospital within their borders.

I cite these facts, not in argument upon the pending bill but that in all our consideration of hospital matters we may remember that every time we furnish another bed at Federal expense we lessen the use of the beds in State, city, county, and private institutions. It is not to be wondered at that many community institutions are having a hard time to get along, because their overhead cost and their lack of patients keep it impossible for them to make both ends meet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON] having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10166) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. HOCH submitted the following conference report on the bill (S. 3619) to reorganize the Federal Power Commission.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3619) entitled "An act to reorganize the Federal Power Commission," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 7, of the engrossed House amendment, change the word "session" to read "sessions."

Page 3, line 14, of the engrossed House amendment, insert the words "a solicitor" after the comma following the word "counsel."

Page 3, line 18, of the engrossed House amendment, change the word "Classificaton" to read "Classification."

Page 5, section 4, of the engrossed House amendment, strike out said section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4. This act shall be held to reorganize the Federal Power Commission created by the Federal water power act, and said Federal water power act shall remain in full force and effect, as herein amended, and no regulations, actions, investigations, or other proceedings under the Federal water power act existing or pending at the time of the approval of this act shall abate or otherwise be affected by reason of the provisions of this act."

And the House agree to the same.

JAMES S. PARKER,
HOMER HOCH,
SAM RAYBURN,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES COUZENS,
JAMES E. WATSON,
KEY PITTMAN.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3619) to reorganize the Federal Power Commission, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House which struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute, with amendments making clerical corrections, providing for a solicitor in addition to other officers provided for in the reorganization of the Federal Power Commission under the bill, and substituting in lieu of the language contained in section 4 of the House amendment, which declared that the act should be held to reorganize and continue the existing Federal Power Commission and not to create a new commission, other language which has the same legal effect.

JAMES S. PARKER,
HOMER HOCH,
SAM RAYBURN,

Managers on the part of the House.

WILSON CREEK BATTLE FIELD

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Wilson Creek Battle Ground at Springfield, Mo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following statement made by me before the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. PALMER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I am appreciative of this opportunity to appear before the Military Affairs Committee of the House in behalf of the bill H. R. 5061, which I introduced November 11, 1929, and reads as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of commemorating the Battle of Wilson Creek, in the State of Missouri, fought on the 10th day of August, 1861, in which Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon was killed, the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to acquire not less than 1 acre of land, free of cost to the United States, erect a suitable monument on said land, and build to approach to said monument on the ground to which the Government shall have acquired title.

"Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of section 1 of this act.

"Sec. 3. The land acquired under section 1 of this act shall be under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of War; and there is authorized to be appropriated for the maintenance of such tract of land, approach, and monument a sum not to exceed \$250 per annum."

The monument is intended to commemorate an important battle of the Civil War, the result of which had a very decided effect upon the retention of the State of Missouri in the Union, and is to honor a great man and military leader, who lost his life in this battle, Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon.

I was informed soon after my arrival in Washington that considerable attention had been given to the study and investigation of this battle field by the part of the historical section, Army War College, which is engaged on this work for Congress, and that a history and maps of the battle were nearly completed and would soon be ready for publication. The bill which I introduced to commemorate these interesting and important historic events has been prepared to conform with the report of the War Department on this battle field, as published in Senate Document No. 187, Seventieth Congress, second session.

I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that out in Missouri, especially around Springfield, we are very much interested in holding memorial services every year, in which we honor the living participants in this battle, recall to memory the glorious deeds of those who are gone, and instill into the newer generations a respect for these heroes and a reverence for the principles for which they fought.

We are most fortunate in having at Drury College, in Springfield, a professor of history named L. E. Meador, who for a number of years has studied the battle field of Wilson Creek in a technical and scientific manner. The people out there look upon Professor Meador with great respect and affection, and he is the leader to whom they turn annually to arrange the exercises held on the battle field. One of the most valuable things he does is to mark the battle field at about 60 places with cards telling briefly what occurred at that particular spot. I hope that my State after the Federal Government has erected this monument on the battle field will continue this commemorative work by setting up markers at all the places where the troops fought.

I want to take up a little of the committee's time to tell briefly of this battle. When Abraham Lincoln was elected President of the United States there was brought to a climax the momentous questions as to the stand which the Federal Government would take on slavery, Southern State rights, and secession. Would Mr. Lincoln, following his inauguration on the 4th of March, 1861, use force with the South or would a disruption of the Union be accepted as a lesser evil than war. The most Southern States very promptly seceded, but somewhere there had to be a border and it happened that that border extended through Maryland, western Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Kansas. Within the limits of the two latter States passions and prejudices were aroused to the highest pitch, and the country seethed with controversial and militant agitation.

A strong and able man, Claiborne F. Jackson, well trained in politics, was elected governor of the State, and he, as were practically all of the members of the new general assembly, was a believer in the doctrine that love and loyalty to one's State was a greater individual duty than to aid in preserving the Union.

The new legislature met at Jefferson City on the 31st of December, 1860, and on the 21st of January passed an act which provided for an election to be held on the 21st of the following month for members of a convention, which was "to consider the relations between the Government of the United States * * * and the Government and people of the State of Missouri; and to adopt such measures for vindicating the sovereignty of the State and the protection of its institutions as shall appear to them to be demanded."

The fight to elect delegates to this convention was three cornered. The "Unconditional union men," one of the parties, led by Frank P. Blair, jr., was successful. Blair had always taken an active part in the political life of Missouri, and the overwhelming success of his party added to his prestige and political power. His fight, however, to retain Missouri in the Union was not won by the success of his party at the polls on February 21.

The first meeting of the convention was held at Jefferson City on the 28th day of February, in accordance with the law creating it. Sterling Price was elected president. As soon as the organization of the 99 delegates was completed, the convention adjourned to meet in St. Louis on March 4, the day on which Mr. Lincoln would be inaugurated.

At this time the State of Missouri was part of the Department of the West, commanded by Brig. Gen. William S. Harney, with headquarters at St. Louis. Harney neither understood the terrible danger of the situation nor did he have the temerity to deal with it had he understood it. Under the guise of giving protection to the State and insuring that she would be a battle ground neither for the secessionists nor for the forces of the United States, a strong party demanded that State representatives seize St. Louis arsenal and confiscate all guns and other equipment stored there.

Harney was afraid to offer much objection to this scheme and informed Washington that to increase the garrison at the arsenal would unduly excite the people and probably result in the needless shedding of some blood. Blair, in his fierce determination to protect the Federal interests within the State in every way possible, bombarded Washington with messages showing the necessity to protect the arsenal with a larger garrison and with a commander possessing some backbone. A company of the Second Infantry, commanded by Capt. Nathaniel Lyon, was ordered to the arsenal and, on the 13th of March, orders were issued by the War Department assigning him to the command of the troops and defenses of that place.

Here was a man made to Blair's measurements—dominating, loyal, brave, enterprising, and indifferent to fate. Blair pictured Lyon to the authorities in Washington in such a way that, when Harney was relieved of his command on April 21, Captain Lyon was placed in temporary charge of the Department of the West.

The contest for possession of the St. Louis arsenal reached a crisis on the 10th of May, when Lyon led his troops against a body of State troops at Camp Jackson, which threatened to seize the arsenal. The clash of contending forces became known immediately to the general assembly, sitting in special session at the capital, and it at once enacted a law for organizing, arming, and equipping the militia, created a military fund, and conferred dictatorial power upon the governor. The legislature took no action on the question of severance from the Union, as this matter had been referred to the specially created convention, but the president of this latter body—Sterling Price—tendered his services to the governor, and following the action of the general assembly authorizing the governor to appoint a major general in command of all the forces which the State might put into the field, he was designated to fill the position.

Developments of a violent nature now followed with great rapidity. General Harney was reinstated. Frank Blair went to Washington to protest against this action, and returned with an order for Harney's relief. He was to be replaced by Lyon, who meanwhile had been elected brigadier general of the volunteer brigade raised in Missouri.

Lyon at once moved portions of his command to Springfield and Jefferson City for the purpose of breaking up hostile organizations, and with the troops under his immediate command followed Governor Jack-

son to Boonville, and on the 13th of June routed a party of State troops that were camped there. Governor Jackson then joined General Price at Lexington, but soon fell back to the southwestern part of the State, where it was hoped the recruiting of their forces would be less disturbed by the nearness of the enemy.

General Lyon followed in the same direction a little later, and while on this campaign Maj. Gen. John C. Frémont arrived in St. Louis to take over the command of the western department.

The withdrawal of Price continued as far as Cassville, where junction with the forces of Generals McCulloch and Pearce was effected, and the combined forces then marched northward on Springfield, where Lyon now had his headquarters.

The commands of General Lyon and General Price met and fought the Battle of Wilson Creek on the 10th day of August, 1861. Now, with your permission, I would like to give you a description of the battle.

In presenting this bill I wish to give a brief description of the battle of Wilson Creek, partly as set forth by an eyewitness. In proportion to the forces engaged, it was the bloodiest battle ever fought on American soil. Gallant sons of Missouri, Iowa, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana were swept down by the terrible missiles of the battle field.

After the Battle of Carthage forces gathered in southwest Missouri with a view to operations upon Springfield and that part of the State. The entire force under Gen. Ben McCulloch moved up and occupied a ravine known as Wilsons Creek, lying some 15 miles south of Springfield. The ravine is of great depth, some 800 yards wide at the top, densely timbered, and watered by a small stream. Its general direction is a little north of west as one enters it from the State road and follows up the ravine. In this ravine forces to the number of 23,000 cavalry and infantry and 21 pieces of artillery took a position which occupied 1 mile east of the road and 2 miles west. The point was a strong one, and in its general character was similar to that of Bull Run and vicinity.

Here Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, with a force of less than 6,000 men, determined to attack the enemy. Day after day he had sent messengers for reinforcements, but none came. An army was nearly cut to pieces, operations of the Government in southwest Missouri had been rendered nugatory, and the prestige of the Federal arms was weakened, if not wholly destroyed. General Lyon detailed the entire force for the expedition, with the exception of the First Iowa Infantry and a small force to guard the town, and soon after dark set out and halted at a distance of 4 or 5 miles from the enemy. At midnight he sent down word for two companions to advance and drive in the enemy's pickets for a distance of 2 miles from his own command and set out at once with his staff to superintend the projected attack in person. He intended to reach the position of the enemy at daylight, taking them by surprise. To do this the Federal forces should have left their position by 2 o'clock; in looking at his watch earlier in the night General Lyon had not held the timepiece in right position. Daylight approached; the general suddenly glanced at his watch. "Why, good God," he exclaimed, "it is 3 o'clock. I have made a terrible mistake." The entire force was immediately turned about and marched to Springfield.

The day following General Lyon was determined to renew his attempt and meet the enemy in his own position, anticipating an attack, which he learned McCulloch would make the next day upon Springfield. It is believed that this attack was made against the advice of a majority of his own officers, and even against his own convictions. He knew the immense superiority of the enemy, but concluded to make the attack and not yield possession of southwestern Missouri without a struggle. In a conversation with one of his staff the day following the unsuccessful attempt to attack he asked the other if he believed in premonitions, saying he did, and was assured that the attack would prove disastrous. The bloody record of the next 24 hours proved that his premonitions were correct.

His force was small and weak, yet he determined to divide it and attack the enemy at two points.

Gen. Franz Sigel, with six pieces of artillery and about 1,300 men, was sent down the State road to make a detour and attack the enemy at the east end of his line, while General Lyon, with the main body of 3,900, proceeded to attack from the west. Before making the attack the general reviewed the forces, passing in front of each command, saying something cheering and complimentary, which everyone received with enthusiasm, for no other officer in the Army enjoyed so fully as himself the esteem and confidence of the soldiers.

At this point I wish to remark that the Iowa First was commanded by Lieut. Col. William H. Merritt, Col. John F. Bates being sick with a fever. He made an effort to go, but after riding a short distance his further progress was absolutely prohibited by his physician and he reluctantly returned to his bed. Lieutenant Colonel Merritt and Maj. A. B. Porter were both in the thickest of the fight all day, constantly encouraging their men both by word and example.

The entire force of the Federal troops was 5,200 men, of which there was one company of Kansas cavalry and four of regular dragoons. The artillery force consisted of 16 pieces, of which 6 went with General Sigel to attack the east end of the ravine, and the balance, including Capt. James Totten's and Lieut. John V. Du Bois's batteries, accompanied the body under General Lyon. A small company of cavalry under

Lieutenant Kelley and a quantity of home guards and two guns were left to guard the town. Soon after dark the forces moved up, respectively, to within 5 miles of their intended points of attack and halted. Daylight came slowly. Nothing was heard from the direction of the enemy. About 10 minutes past 5 the heavy boom of artillery rolled through the town, sending a thrill through every heart like a shock of electricity.

Both of the Federal forces arrived on the grounds designed for the respective attacks of each a little after sunrise, and instead of making a surprise, as was expected, they found the enemy all prepared for them, having been notified by their videttes, who ran in without firing a shot—at least this was the case on the side approached by the forces under General Lyon.

At the west end of the enemy's line the ravine takes a short turn and runs to the north. The enemy was in the ravine, his flank extending up to the point where the ravine makes its turn. Right on the west bank of the bend and commanding the ravine to the east Captain Totten's battery was stationed. A little back of Captain Totten and a little more to the left was Du Bois's battery, also commanding the ravine and sweeping it, in connection with the other battery, with a cross fire. On the right of the batteries and facing the south bank of the ravine the First Missouri Regiment was stationed, while to the rear, on ground that sloped from the brow of the ravine down to the spring, the Iowa and Kansas regiments were stationed as a reserve. Following down the right bank of the ravine, at a distance of 150 yards, was a space covered with a stunted undergrowth of oak, which reached the timber where the enemy was posted in great strength. Following on down the right bank of the ravine, at a point about halfway between the brow and foot of the hill, was the first battery of the enemy, and a little farther on, and more to the left, another. Three-fourths of a mile or so farther down the ravine was the baggage of the enemy and their camp. About 2 miles beyond where the ravine ran south again for a short distance was posted another portion of the enemy, and right there General Sigel commenced his attack.

The engagement was opened by throwing a company or so of regulars who acted as skirmishers in front of the Missouri regiment. A few volleys from them elicited a heavy return from the enemy posted in the timber in front, before which the regulars fell back in good order, although considerably cut up. A rush from the enemy followed, whereupon Captain Totten opened on them with his four pieces with round shot and cannister. The enemy directed their batteries upon the Federal artillery, and upon the right line, firing shell and round shot with great rapidity, nearly all of dangerous missiles passing too high, a fact shown in the circumstance that during all the tremendous fire poured upon him Captain Totten did not lose a single man.

In the meantime the right of the artillery, protected by the First Missouri, was swept by the musketry of the enemy. A full regiment of the enemy suddenly made a dart forward, upon the Missouri First, and had reached within 50 yards of them when the deadly fire poured in upon them from the gallant First caused them to falter and finally to break for the cover they had just left, leaving a number of their force upon the ground. Scarcely had the fragments of that regiment vanished ere another came purring out and advanced in the track of their predecessors. Again did the gallant First pour in volley after volley upon them, until they, too, broke and fled to the rear. A third regiment took their place, with precisely the same result. But the incessant storm of lead that swept the ground occupied by the Missouri First had told fearfully upon them, and their shattered ranks were ordered to the rear, while the Kansas First Regiment came up and took their place. The Kansas men gallantly stood the storm for a while, and then with decimated ranks gave way to the First Iowa. Lying flat on their faces, the Federal forces poured in their fire with telling effect, and finally drove the enemy gradually down the ravine until they, thinking the battle lost, fired their baggage wagons and prepared for retreat. But with no fresh body of troops to aid them, the Federal men could not retain their advantage, even after they gained it, as was shown once in the case of one of the enemy's batteries, from which every man was driven and the guns silenced by the deadly accuracy of the fire poured in upon them by Totten and Du Bois. If the Federal forces had had men enough to have sent reinforcements forward at this juncture the battle would have been decided.

Soon after the fight commenced General Lyon saw how fearfully the enemy outnumbered him, and he gave up the day as lost. From that time he seemed utterly regardless of life and, in fact, scarcely conscious of anything. A ball struck him in the leg, to which he paid no attention, and soon after another struck him in the head, inflicting a severe flesh wound. He bled freely but refused to move out of the line of fire. The Iowa Regiment was occupying the brow of the hill to the right of the battery, exposed to a galling fire from the woods in front. General Lyon stood calmly a few steps in the rear of the color company, bare-headed, with balls hailing around him in frightful quantities.

"If some one will lead us, we will clear that woods with the bayonet," remarked one of the men.

"I will lead you," said General Lyon, and at that instant a ball entered his breast, passing through his body just above the heart. He fell instantly, and a moment after reaching the ground said: "Iowa

Regiment, you are noble boys." A little later he grew weaker, and his last words were: "Forward, my brave men. I will lead you."

It is believed by many that he did not desire to live after finding that he could make no headway against the immense odds opposed to him; he saw at a glance the result of defeat both to him and to the cause which he revered; he saw that all his efforts from the hour in which he took Camp Jackson to that of his splendid effort at Boonville, and from that down to the present—the tremendous fatigue of the march to Springfield, the labors at Forsyth, Dug Springs, Greenfield, Carthage, and Mount Vernon—all were in vain, and, like a brave but despondent soldier, he dared to die rather than live. Two horses were shot under him a short time before his death, and one of his white-plumed bodyguards almost at the very same moment of his fall dropped mortally wounded by his side.

Gen. Nathaniel Lyon, a graduate of West Point, lived the life of a brave soldier and was an honor to his country in death, persisting in and fighting for the cause he held sacred, braving the fire of the enemy to make one last effort to win the battle of the day. His body was taken to St. Louis in a wagon by detailed soldiers, where he was put upon a train and returned to his home in Connecticut.

The Iowa regiment fought on, gathering in line to resist the onset of the enemy while the wearied, broken fragments of the army were collected in order preparatory to a retreat. The enemy saw the maneuver and again and again hurled themselves against the First Iowa in order to break through it and precipitate themselves upon the fragmentary columns. Had Iowa yielded the result would have been woeful—the retreat would have become a savage massacre; but they breasted like rocks the iron hail and tremendous charges of the enemy, pouring in a deadly fire and holding the enemy in complete check until the Union forces were forming and moving, and then and not until then did they leave their positions.

The Iowa regiment suffered severely. The gallant Capt. Alexander L. Mason, of the color company (C), while urging on his men, received a ball through the thigh and died in 10 minutes. His first lieutenant, William Pursell, received a severe wound. Three others of the company were killed in their tracks and some 10 others wounded, but through all the colors never for a single moment kissed the dust. At one time the Iowans were ordered to rise and charge upon the enemy, who lay concealed less than 50 yards away. George Pierce, of the Governor's Greys, sprang to his feet and fired upon the mounted officer who galloped in front and appeared to urge the enemy to charge. The officer tumbled from his horse and at almost the same instant George Pierce dropped, shot through the thigh. There are many incidents of great interest connected with the battle that space will not permit to mention.

The killed on the Federal side were about 50 and the wounded about 650, while the casualties of the enemy were considered treble this number. The Union men took 250 prisoners, about 400 horses, and various equipment.

The success of General Sigel was indifferent. He defended his position bravely for several hours, but finally the enemy flanked him, and, his artillery horses all being killed, he dismounted five of the guns, set fire to the carriages, and with a single piece cut his way through and retreated upon Springfield. Those were the only guns lost in action. After Captain Mason, of the color company (C), was killed and his first lieutenant, William Pursell, wounded, no other commissioned officer remained.

By 3 o'clock in the afternoon the forces had all retired and soon after the wounded began to come in. A flag of truce went out soon after to bring in the wounded and bury the dead, and up to a later hour the work still went on. The men who bore the flag reported that they were taken to General McCulloch in person, who treated them with great courtesy, joked with them a little about their ill success, assured them that he intended to kill Sigel at all events, offered them some refreshments, and readily gave them the desired permission to carry away the wounded and bury the dead.

During the whole day and the previous night Springfield was the scene of great confusion—citizens, anticipating an instant attack, were packing their effects and flying in crowds to all parts of the State for safety. The troops commenced a retreat upon Rolla about 3 o'clock the next morning, deeming it madness to attempt to hold Springfield.

This bill is now in the omnibus bill, H. R. 11613, and has been reported out favorably by the committee. I am anxious that it be passed in order that we may pay honor to these brave soldiers and leaders in the Battle of Wilson Creek.

RELIEF OF KENTUCKY TOBACCO GROWERS

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to call the attention of every one of you to the desperate plight of the tobacco growers of Kentucky and the South, and more particularly to the urgent need for relief of tobacco farm-

ers in my own State of Kentucky, with the needs of which I am more familiar.

On December 9, 1929, I introduced in the House a bill (H. R. 6973) to amend the revenue act of 1926 by reducing the tax on cigarettes. I have attempted repeatedly to gain hearings for this measure before the House Ways and Means Committee, for I have had the assurance of practically every representative man in the tobacco-producing field that he would appear before the committee and explain the necessity, the immediate necessity, of cutting this tax as proposed in my bill. I have only a few days ago filed a brief with the committee, and have finally won the assurance that my people would have a chance to be heard when Congress convenes again in the fall. This Congress was practically pledged to the relief of the farmer, and although they may have been said to have secured some benefits as a result of the legislation enacted during this session, I wish to declare here and now against the continued and almost studied neglect suffered by the tobacco farmers of Kentucky.

Tobacco farmers in Kentucky, which is one of the largest tobacco-producing States in the country, are not receiving a fair price for their tobacco when compared with prices received for other products. When they complain of this—and they have a right to complain—they are told that the heavy tax on tobacco is responsible, and that if this tax were to be lightened, they would then receive a better price for their tobacco. For the past 10 years Kentucky tobacco farmers have received from 25 to 35 cents per pound on their tobacco, yet the Government collects \$1 per pound on this same tobacco, exclusive of the stamp tax, which is an extra and most unjust imposition on these farmers, who are already carrying more than their fair share of the tax burden of this great country.

On the cheaper grade of tobacco, which sells for from 18 to 20 cents per pound, the Government draws a flat rate of 18 cents per pound. It is the cigarette tobacco, which comprises more than half of the tobacco crop of Kentucky, that is carrying this terrific load. I contend that this is a downright injustice, and, furthermore, that ignoring the claims of these tobacco farmers put us in a very poor light, for they are every whit as much entitled to the aid of their Government as are the beet growers, the wheat farmers, the corn growers, and every other variety of agriculturists, practically all of whom have been aided by the Government, leaving the tobacco farmer out in the cold, to shift and make out for themselves.

Evidently, so far as the Government and the tobacco farmers is concerned, "There is no balm in Gilead." But they are becoming restless under their burden, and unless they are given honest recognition, which they have every right to expect from their Government, they will find a way to throw this tax burden off.

Tobacco is now the greatest revenue producer, for the Government, of all commodities, bringing into the Treasury of the United States a gold stream of more than a million of dollars daily. I repeat that it is not fair nor just that the tobacco farmers should be made to bear this tremendous burden. Despite this terrific load, the tobacco industry, apart from the farmers, has thrived and prospered. Farmers have increased the acreage devoted to this crop in the vain hope that justice would eventually be accorded to them and they would be able to recoup and recover from the many lean years they have had.

But their hopes have been ignored, their petitions have been pigeonholed, and their pleas not listened to. But they are a mighty and a formidable group and will continue to insist on recognition of their needs and surcease from their wrongs until they secure relief from the killing tax which eventually might force them to devote themselves to more profitable pursuits and result in a great loss of revenue to the Government.

As the situation is now, the only ones securing any benefit from this great crop of tobacco are the manufacturers and the Government, both of whom are fattening on the sweat and labor of the tobacco farmer. The prosperity of the cigarette manufacturers is notorious. The tobacco companies earn fabulous profits, and from the tobacco crop the Government derives enormous revenue.

The tobacco products of the country last year had a value well over \$1,200,000,000, of which the largest portion represented the manufacture of cigarettes. In the 10 years from 1919 to 1929 the population of the United States increased from 105,000,000 to 121,400,000. But the increase in the consumption of cigarettes was at a decidedly higher rate than the increase in population. Per capita consumption of cigarettes in 1929 was 981, as compared with 506 in 1919. Per capita consumption of cigars, on the other hand, declined from 67 in 1919 to 54 in 1929. This decline in the consumption of cigars has fallen just a little short of offsetting the great increase in the consumption of cigarettes. A much more significant decrease took place in

the consumption of manufactured tobacco, a decline of 25 per cent being noted from 1919 to 1929. The expansion in the use of cigarettes, therefore, in the past 10 years almost entirely is due to the substitution of the cigarette for the pipe and cigar.

Four great companies may be said to dominate the tobacco manufacturing field, and it is to their agents that the greater part of the tobacco crop in Kentucky and the South is sold. They produce approximately 95 per cent of the total number of cigarettes sold and produced in the United States, a large proportion of the output being confined to the sale of four well-known brands. A striking instance of the injustice of the revenue tax is shown in the net profit figures of these four companies. One of them reported an increase of 201.3 per cent during the past decade, another reported a gain of 189.8 per cent during that same period. The gain for the combined companies aggregated 114.5 per cent. The injustice to which I refer, and which springs entirely from the attitude of these companies, and which is based on the cigarette tax, is shown in the same sort of net profit figures of the tobacco farmers, spread over the same period. Ask any tobacco farmer what his profits are to-day as compared with those of 10 years ago and you will soon find out how he stands. The following tables, showing the acreage devoted to the cultivation of tobacco, the production, and the value of the tobacco crop strikingly illustrate the fact that the farmers of Kentucky have not benefited in any sense commensurate with the enormous profits of these cigarette manufacturing companies. Only a small, a very small, percentage of increase is noted, and this increase is absolutely nullified by the greatly overbalancing increase in the cost of other commodities to the farmers and by the increase in the cost of labor.

TOBACCO ACREAGE

States	1900	1910	1927	1928
Alabama	1,141	211		
Arkansas	1,887	758		
Florida	2,056	3,987	8,800	12,000
Georgia	2,304	2,025	81,500	122,300
Kentucky	354,805	469,795	290,200	394,700
Louisiana	275	519	1,000	1,000
Maryland	42,911	26,072	32,000	31,000
Mississippi	203	49		
Missouri	4,361	5,433	4,000	4,000
North Carolina	203,023	221,890	659,000	730,000
Oklahoma	252	82		
South Carolina	25,993	30,082	104,000	148,000
Tennessee	71,849	90,408	87,800	112,400
Texas	1,443	324		
Virginia	184,334	185,427	177,000	186,000
West Virginia	5,129	17,928	4,500	6,800
Total	931,966	1,055,050	1,449,800	1,748,200
United States	1,101,460	1,294,911	1,584,900	1,912,100

TOBACCO PRODUCTION (POUNDS)

Alabama	311,950	90,572		
Arkansas	831,700	316,418		
Florida	1,125,600	3,505,801	8,228,000	9,221,000
Georgia	1,105,600	1,485,994	59,088,000	84,387,000
Kentucky	314,288,050	398,482,301	202,269,000	306,000,000
Louisiana	102,100	172,418	400,000	405,000
Maryland	24,589,480	17,845,699	26,176,000	21,700,000
Mississippi	62,760	18,600		
Missouri	3,041,996	5,372,738	4,400,000	4,400,000
North Carolina	127,503,400	138,813,163	485,683,000	475,230,000
Oklahoma	108,910	50,546		
South Carolina	19,895,970	25,583,049	76,648,000	82,288,000
Tennessee	49,157,550	68,756,599	68,484,000	88,459,000
Texas	550,120	161,533		
Virginia	122,884,900	132,979,390	127,971,000	111,600,000
West Virginia	3,087,140	14,356,400	3,488,000	5,100,000
Total	668,647,226	807,991,221	1,062,835,000	1,188,790,000
United States	868,112,865	1,055,764,803	1,211,909,000	1,373,501,000

TOBACCO VALUE

Alabama	\$55,581	\$14,892		
Arkansas	85,395	40,489		
Florida	254,211	1,025,476	\$2,865,000	\$2,687,000
Georgia	150,659	297,167	11,440,000	11,178,000
Kentucky	18,541,982	39,868,753	43,349,000	58,550,000
Louisiana	20,488	42,617	180,000	181,000
Maryland	1,438,169	1,457,112	6,020,000	3,906,000
Mississippi	9,225	3,390		
Missouri	218,991	676,479	968,000	968,000
North Carolina	8,033,091	13,847,559	106,850,000	87,918,000
Oklahoma	11,815	5,812		
South Carolina	1,297,293	2,123,576	15,713,000	10,461,000
Tennessee	2,748,495	5,661,681	14,661,000	19,492,000
Texas	104,694	26,034		
Virginia	7,210,195	12,169,086	22,828,000	19,180,000
West Virginia	228,620	1,923,180	855,000	1,173,000
Total	40,423,504	79,182,803	225,729,000	215,654,000
United States	56,987,902	104,303,856	256,882,000	254,322,000

Kentucky is the second largest tobacco-producing State in the Union, being exceeded in the value of its tobacco crop and in the extent of acreage devoted to tobacco raising only by the State of North Carolina. Yet the rich weed represents the largest single agricultural item produced in the State. For that reason it is singularly important that in attempting to grant relief to agriculture, this crop, which is of such prime importance to the farmers and to the general prosperity of Kentucky, should receive the consideration which its importance and magnitude merit.

There is not any doubt but what the increase in cigarette consumption which would be brought about by cutting in half the tax on cigarettes would more than counterbalance the temporary loss in revenue to the treasury as a result of the cut in the tax. Cigarette consumption, now temporarily hampered, would increase enormously with the resulting decrease in the cost of a package of cigarettes. It is not too optimistic to look for a 100 per cent increase in cigarette consumption. Many tobacco users now stint themselves to a stipulated number of cigarettes per day, many smoking less than a package per day on account of the expense incident to the smoking habit. Women in increasingly large numbers are smoking cigarettes, yet their use of tobacco in cigarette form will be restricted as long as the price remains as it is. With a reduction in the tax, which will be followed by a reduction in the price of cigarettes, women in greater numbers will buy the cigarettes which they now wish to buy which are denied to them because of their present high price.

Half of Kentucky's crop of Burley tobacco goes into the manufacture of cigarettes, or more than half, the balance being used for fine plug and pipe tobacco. The tax on this tobacco is now 18 cents, as against 8 cents before the war. The tax was devised solely as a war-time measure, but it has proven such a gold mine that there has been no effort to discontinue or even to lessen it. The taxes on other so-called luxuries have been in some instances eliminated and in others the taxes have been cut. The Burley tobacco producers have alone suffered neglect when remedial measures were being considered and enacted.

A cut in the tax on cigarettes, the tobacco for which Kentucky produces a great share in her wonderful Burley, will mean increased consumption of cigarettes and the Government will receive as great an amount of revenue from this increased consumption as it is now receiving as the result of an excessive tax, a war-time tax, and at the same time it will provide relief for the tobacco farmer. It will mean much to those poor people who are unable to afford buying cigarettes as they wish to, who are restricted by the present high cost of cigarettes, caused by this onerous tax.

The tobacco farmers of the South and of Kentucky are becoming aroused at the neglect which they have been subjected to in this matter of tax relief. As the representative of one of the greatest tobacco-producing centers in the United States, I demand for them the consideration which they deserve, which they are entitled to as honest, productive citizens of this country. I demand for them consideration of their needs; alleviation and a lessening of the heavy burdens this country is forcing them to carry. I demand for them the same consideration which has been accorded to industry, the same measure of helpfulness which has been extended to the cigarette manufacturers. This consideration, this relief, is due them; they are entitled to it, and eventually they will get it.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 259

Mr. MICHAELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAELSON. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service as a Member of Congress it has been my aim to represent, as nearly as I could interpret them, the desires of my constituents. Resolutions of indorsement from organizations, letters of recommendation and praise from individuals, and my continued return to office over a period of years lead me to believe that I have been successful. Now comes the apparently all-important question of prohibition, with the desire on the part of many of our citizens on the one hand for the repeal of the Volstead Act and the eighteenth amendment, and on the other the insistent demand of many others for the strict enforcement of the same. On this question the newspapers, and especially those published in Chicago, serving as they do their own particular ends and prejudices, have from time to time characterized me as a dry. I desire to say to them, and to anyone else concerned, that I am not a dry; neither am I a wet.

My interest in the question and in every other question as it comes before the Congress for action is in the preservation

of our Government, the right of our people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, protection of our homes and persons, and the welfare of our citizens.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at no time in the last nine years, during which time I have served as a Member of this House, has the question of modifying or repealing the Volstead Act or the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States appeared on this floor for a vote by the membership of the House. Only on two occasions during that time have the Members been called on to vote on an amendment to the Volstead Act. The first was on June 27, 1921, on the Campbell amendment to prevent the sale of beer as a medicine. The vote was 250 yeas and 93 nays. I voted for the amendment because at that time, so far as I could ascertain, no one wanted beer as a medicine. I do not believe anyone would consider this as either a wet or dry vote, but rather a vote to clarify existing law. The only other instance was the amendment to the Volstead Act commonly known as the Jones law, passed by the House February 28, 1929, the vote being 284 yeas and 90 nays. I voted for this amendment, not from the standpoint of wet or dry but because I believed, as did the people generally throughout the country, that a more severe penalty for commercialized law violators might produce a deterrent effect on those and their kind who were responsible for the terrible St. Valentine's Day massacre in Chicago, which had just recently shocked the entire Nation and which brought numberless appeals for relief from a long-suffering people thoroughly fed up on crime, lawlessness, and law breaking.

Whatever hopes anyone had in this regard have since been dashed to the ground. Crime is on the increase, respect for law and order is noticeably on the decline, and the emphasis that was put on the cell and stone pile as deterrents is meeting with contempt and seems not to have had the desired effect.

Recent occurrences, including the ballot taken by the Literary Digest, have convinced me that the people of this country are losing faith in the efficacy of both the eighteenth amendment and legislation passed in pursuance of it. I have come to the conclusion that the people of my district and generally throughout the country hold this amendment and these laws to be responsible for much of the graft, corruption, and crime which has become general throughout the country. I think that the people also have reached the conclusion that this endeavor to make the country dry by force is weakening the foundation of our political institutions and creating precedents which later will result in great harm to the country.

Until recently I had not heard of any affirmative proposals that would cure the situation without bringing back the old evil of the saloons. Recently, however, I did have called to my attention a plan which has been published by Chester E. Cleveland, one of the leading lawyers of Chicago, which, in my opinion, if carried out will eliminate most of the evil attendant on the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution and the legislation pursuant thereto.

I desire to submit to Congress this proposed plan, and pursuant thereto I introduced a resolution yesterday, known as House Resolution 259, providing for the amendment of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in accordance with the plan outlined by Mr. Cleveland.

This resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives shall report to the House of Representatives for consideration a joint resolution having for its purpose the amendment of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to provide substantially as follows: "The exclusive power to tax, license, regulate, or suppress the manufacture, sale, transportation, exportation, and importation of intoxicating liquors shall be vested in the Congress."

Such an amendment as this would overcome the existing evils following from the eighteenth amendment as it now exists and the laws passed in pursuance thereof, and at the same time would provide an adequate guaranty against the recurrence of the evils of the liquor traffic, to prevent which was the purpose of the eighteenth amendment.

Under the proposed amendment the different States could not enact varying and conflicting laws relating to the liquor traffic, but the whole power of control would be vested in the Congress. The Congress would not then have its hands tied by a rigid constitutional provision such as the eighteenth amendment, but would be vested with discretion to make from time to time such rules and regulations as a majority of the representatives of the people found from experience would be best for all the people of the country.

No one can foresee everything the Congress, in the exercise of its discretion in the light of experience, could do under and in pursuance of the proposed amendment. However, among other things the Congress could make laws to—

(a) Absolutely prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, which would not change the present conditions; or

(b) Authorize the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer; or

(c) Authorize such of the States as would so desire to manufacture or sell intoxicating liquors, or both. This plan has been found in Canada from experience to be satisfactory and preferable to absolute prohibition; or

(d) Authorize the several States to exercise the right of local option under such conditions as to protect other States;

(e) Prevent sale of poison disguised as intoxicating liquor;

(f) Suppress bootlegging;

(g) Do away with the enormous expense, corruption, criminality, and violence attendant upon the vain efforts to enforce the eighteenth amendment and the laws made in pursuance thereof.

As before indicated, the above schedule is not exhaustive but only suggestive of some of the things the Congress might do.

There are some people who think the eighteenth amendment should be repealed without any substitute therefor; thus revesting in the several States the police power to regulate and control the traffic in intoxicating liquor.

This view seems to be based on a misapprehension of the nature of the police power involved and a failure to take into consideration clause 3, section 8, of Article I of the Constitution of the United States as follows:

The Congress shall have power * * * to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States * * *.

Generally speaking, the police power of the States has to do with matters purely local, such as murder, larceny, burglary, and so forth. But the particular phase of the police power pertaining to the traffic in intoxicating liquor deals with commerce, both intrastate and interstate and with foreign nations.

Hence, if the eighteenth amendment be repealed, without any substitute therefor, that part of the police power which pertains to interstate commerce and commerce with foreign nations will remain with the Congress and the residuum will be vested separately in the 48 different States. This would result in a divided authority and responsibility, which is undesirable, to say the least, as past experience has demonstrated.

I respectfully submit that those who are seeking to remedy the existing evils are doing their cause more harm than good by proposing remedies which contemplate the evasion or nullification of the eighteenth amendment. They should recognize that the eighteenth amendment is now a supreme law of the land; and the only course open to law-abiding citizens is to secure its repeal or amendment in an orderly and legal way as provided in the Constitution. That it may take a long time to do so is not a valid reason against adopting that remedy. Makeshifts and attempts to accomplish anything by evading or nullifying the amendment will accomplish nothing, but will only postpone and delay the real remedy.

The regulation of the liquor traffic is a police regulation. It ought not to be in the Constitution; and the true remedy is to get it out of the Constitution.

It seems to me that the mere repeal of the amendment would be undesirable, because that would restore conditions as they were in the old saloon days, before the amendment was adopted.

It seems to me this proposed amendment has two advantages:

First. It will vest the discretion to control the liquor traffic in one controlling body, viz, the Congress, and since such control is essentially a matter of commerce it should be so vested. This is particularly so since, if the control should be revested in the several States, one State is practically powerless to protect itself against the action of other States.

Second. This question can not be settled by either the fanatical dries or the rabid wets; but the appeal must be made to the great body of reasonable people who are more concerned in the preservation of our institutions than in either preventing anyone from taking a drink or allowing him to have all he wants without any regulation whatever. Many citizens who would oppose the repeal of the eighteenth amendment because they believe it would restore the saloons as they were before the amendment was adopted would gladly support an amendment which would put the control of the traffic in Congress with power to pass such regulatory laws, from time to time, as they, in their discretion, found to be for the best interests of the entire country. Hence, as it seems to me, we can reasonably expect to procure such an amendment as I have suggested in a much shorter time than we could procure a flat repeal of the eighteenth amendment.

The time is ripe to start the movement for the amendment of the eighteenth amendment. In order to crystallize public sentiment for or against such an amendment, I favor a nation-wide

referendum or a referendum by States on this question at the earliest possible moment.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on to-morrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is to-morrow the day for considering bills on the Private Calendar?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No. The deficiency appropriation bill is the order of business on to-morrow. The Chair will note that general debate is in order and the time has not been limited.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no doubt whatever but what the gentleman from Nebraska can secure 15 or more minutes from the chairman of the committee during general debate. I do not think we should hold up the business of the House when the speech of the gentleman from Nebraska can just as well be delivered to the Committee of the Whole as to the House itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I object.

NAVAL AIR STATION, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 9231) providing for the acquirement of additional lands for the naval air station at Seattle, Wash.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 3341 be substituted for House bill 9231, they being identical.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 3341 for the House bill. Is there objection to the substitution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 3341, providing for the acquirement of additional lands for the naval air station at Seattle, Wash., with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate bill 3341, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire by purchase or condemnation two adjoining tracts of land located at the southeasterly corner of the naval air station reservation at Seattle, Wash.; one tract containing 20.65 acres, and the other tract containing approximately 10 acres, each tract with a frontage of approximately 900 feet on Lake Washington; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to acquire these tracts of land at a cost not to exceed \$50,000.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, this little bill is for the acquisition of two tracts of land comprising something like 30 acres, to round out the naval aviation field at Seattle, or, rather, it is called the Seattle flying field, formerly called the Sand Point flying field. This flying field does not happen to be in the congressional district I have the honor to represent but it lies adjacent to the city limits. The two tracts comprise less than 30 acres, and these two tracts open immediately upon a large body of fresh water known as Lake Washington and are needed by the Navy Department. It has recommended it frequently to round out the field in order to give a greater length of take-off. The prevailing winds in that locality are north and south and this extends the field in that direction. As both of these tracts abut upon this large body of water they make a much better rounded-out field. The field has been quite a school for the Reserve Officers' unit. Large airplanes and bombers from the Navy Department have been tested out on that field, and it has been demonstrated over and over again that a longer runway is necessary for these heavy machines. It is with a view of accommodating that branch of the Navy Air Service that the Navy Department is seeking to acquire this property.

I may say that this field was donated by the county of King, in which it is located, to the Navy Department some years ago. It was acquired by the county at an expense of something over \$400,000, subsequently donated to the Government, and upon that field there are now many activities taking place. The

Government has heretofore appropriated something like \$850,000 for the development of that field.

I may say in reference to the general military situation that this is the only field operated by either the Navy or the Army in the far Northwest. It is the only field operated by the Navy north of San Diego, and, therefore, the military necessity of it is apparent to everyone, not only in the Navy but in the Army.

The field at the present time comprises about 413 acres and the addition of these 29 acres will round out the field until it can come into its greatest degree of usefulness. There is a third tract of land which the Navy would like to have, but it is not considering it now.

The bill provides that the cost of this land shall not exceed \$50,000. That is a small item when you consider equipping a naval enterprise with every element of success.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume the gentleman has personal acquaintance with the two tracts that are sought to be obtained?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Adjacent to the present naval air station?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice from the hearings that at least one of the tracts has been used for a gravel pit and that considerable gravel has been excavated from the ground. To what extent has the land been excavated?

Mr. MILLER. On one tract there has been no excavation whatever, but on tract No. 1 there has been for some years what is ordinarily called a gravel pit. There was a slight hillock on that piece of property immediately adjacent to the water, and gravel was taken out of that for several years. However, it has not been operated for two or three years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the fact that gravel has been taken from this one tract render it necessary to fill it up, or is it in such a state that it can be utilized for flying purposes?

Mr. MILLER. The land will have to be leveled off. However, there is no depression there which will have to be filled in. The little knoll remains where gravel has heretofore been taken out. That will have to be removed, and that will be immediately sluiced to a little low place in the ground 40 yards distant.

Mr. STAFFORD. That work is not of any great extent and will not involve a large amount of expense?

Mr. MILLER. No; a very small amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, a further inquiry: Where is this naval station situated as compared with the University of Washington, whose grounds are on Lake Washington?

Mr. MILLER. It is about 1½ miles from the State university, and at that university they have a course in aeronautics.

Mr. STAFFORD. In what direction is it—to the west or east?

Mr. MILLER. To the east and south.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is toward Seattle?

Mr. MILLER. No; opposite Seattle. Seattle is to the west and north of it, the main part of the city; it is in what we might call the university district.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I assume this is in the gentleman's district?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is in the gentleman's State?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; in my State. It is in the district of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is just as well. It is in a good man's district.

Mr. MILLER. Yes; both of us are good men.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. The gentleman says he is familiar with this land; does the gentleman regard \$1,600 an acre as a fair price for the land?

Mr. MILLER. I do, for the reason that this part of the city is developing very rapidly. The University of Washington is an immense institution, and all the surrounding country in that neighborhood is developing more rapidly than any other portion of the city. This tract is about a mile, or at the most a mile and a half, from the university and is all divided into lots, some of which are being improved, and the thing which the Navy has had in mind for some time is the rapid develop-

ment of this part of the city and the desirability of acquiring this land as soon as possible. The quicker they can acquire it, automatically the less will be the price. This is what has hastened the legislation. It was passed by the Senate just the other day.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. As I recall this field, it is about a mile and a half from the city.

Mr. MILLER. No; from the State university. The city limits run immediately to one side of the field.

Mr. BRITTEN. It is practically in the city.

Mr. MILLER. Yes; it is always considered in that way.

Mr. BRITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman, if he will permit, an acre of land for subdivision purposes usually amounts to eight or nine city lots, after allowing for streets and alleys, and if you will take this \$1,600 and divide it by 8 or 9, it figures about \$200 for a city lot, and the gentleman will realize that is rather cheap. Sixteen hundred dollars an acre sounds high, I will agree with the gentleman, when you are considering acreage.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. If I may be permitted a further observation, I have noticed that the driving of a few stakes and the laying out of a few lines in some proposed development becomes a pretty expensive proposition.

Mr. BRITTEN. Sometimes it does; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia and Mr. TABER rose.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. With reference to the question of the gentleman from Virginia, is it not the fact that this land is water-front property?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. And very beautiful water-front property?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; it fronts on a fresh-water lake, and is very beautiful land.

Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia. I recall that was the testimony before the committee.

Mr. TABER. As I recall, this land lies to the east of the city toward the upland, and Lake Washington is probably 4 or 5 or 6 miles away from the sound?

Mr. MILLER. About 3 miles.

Mr. TABER. This part of it must be 4 or 5 miles away, is it not?

Mr. MILLER. Well, there is a large canal running from the sound into an intermediate lake called Lake Union, which is a Government canal, by the way, and from the intermediate lake of Lake Union the water flows into Lake Washington, which is a very substantial body of fresh water, probably 20 miles long and 5 miles wide.

Mr. TABER. This land is entirely undeveloped, and a year or so ago when I was out there it was all grown up with brambles and other brush, without any development, and without ever having been cleared, as I remember it.

Mr. MILLER. No; the situation has changed somewhat since the gentleman was there. I believe the gentleman was there four years ago?

Mr. TABER. Something like that; yes.

Mr. MILLER. Four or five years ago, I do not recall which. There has been a very substantial development in that locality, and all the brush and bramble have been cleared off. One main street has been cut through, and some houses are being built there. The bill authorizes the acquiring of this land either by purchase or condemnation. I presume probably the first procedure will be to see what agreed price the property owners will take, and if that is deemed exorbitant, then it will be acquired otherwise, within the limits fixed in the bill. It can not exceed \$50,000. If we can not get the land for that price, of course, it falls entirely. The appraised valuation of the two tracts is \$48,126.

Mr. TABER. The appraised valuation is something like \$1,600 an acre?

Mr. MILLER. Forty-eight thousand dollars.

Mr. TABER. For 30 acres?

Mr. MILLER. Approximately 30 acres—30.65 acres.

Mr. TABER. This station is not a regular naval station, but is a naval-reserve station that is used for the training of the reservists in that part of the country and the students in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps at the University of Washington; is not that correct?

Mr. MILLER. No; that is not exactly the situation. The Congress has mapped out a \$5,000,000 program for the development of this aviation field, of which \$1,850,000 has been authorized and \$850,000 has been appropriated. At the present time there are permanent brick barracks for some 250 men, with

administration buildings, heating plants, hangars, railroad sidings, drainage works, electric lights, water, and so forth, all supplied to the field; and as soon as the development reaches the proper stage, the Navy Department will immediately make this the great naval air base in the Northwest.

Mr. TABER. I note that the department, in commenting on this bill, says:

While the Navy Department feels that this measure is very desirable and also necessary, on the other hand, the expenditures involved would result in exceeding the total cost of the naval estimate submitted to Congress for the next fiscal year, and the Navy Department is, therefore, impelled to recommend against the enactment of the bill at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say that the Budget limits the amount of naval expenditures, of which the gentleman has knowledge, he being on the Appropriations Committee. Realizing that if the Budget fund has been reached, the Navy Department always recommends against any further legislation, making appropriation or authorization.

The Navy Department appropriation bill has passed, and this is an authorization that will come in next year's appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. The Navy Department did not feel that this was of sufficient importance so that they would be willing to let something else go in order to put this ahead.

Mr. MILLER. I can not say that that is the atmosphere exactly. I want to read from the hearings on this bill a statement by Admiral Parsons, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which will be found on page 2436 of the hearings. I said to him:

This has been under consideration by the department for some time?

He said "yes," and then I read the last paragraph from the department's report, which the gentleman from New York has just read, and said they recommend against the enactment of the bill but practically apologize for having to do so. I asked him if these tracts are desirable for the proper expansion of the air field, and Admiral Parsons said:

They are, undoubtedly, extremely desirable. One of them is within the city limits and one of them is adjacent to the city limits. We feel that if this land is not purchased within a reasonable time you may have to pay a great deal more for it. These tracts will permit of the lengthening of the runways very materially, which is considered very essential for the proper development of the Sand Point Station.

Mr. TABER. What is the length in the runways now?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know exactly, probably about 3,500 feet. The report says:

The purchase of these two areas will permit the development of two take-off and landing runways, each about 1 mile in length and each with approaches over the water—

And so forth.

Acquisition of these two parcels will permit the extension of flying lanes 5 and 6 to lengths of 5,650 and 5,200 feet, respectively. These lanes are almost directly coincident with the prevailing wind direction.

The present site of the naval air station was donated to the United States by King County, Wash. Its area is approximately 413 acres. Operations have shown the necessity for longer take-off lanes running north and south (the prevailing wind direction) and also for providing against possible erection on the south side of structures that might be hazardous to flying. These two important facts will be accomplished to a large degree by the acquisition of the two tracts above referred to. The latest estimates on flying in the Navy Department indicate that the probable cost involved is \$48,485.

Mr. PALMER. What is the assessed value of this land?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know; I have not made any investigation.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. I understood the gentleman to say that the assessed value of the land was about \$48,000.

Mr. MILLER. No; I said the appraised value.

Mr. GARBER of Virginia. The gentleman does not know what the assessed value is?

Mr. MILLER. No; I do not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that not taken care of by the condemnation proceedings?

Mr. MILLER. If it can not be purchased, it would go through condemnation proceedings.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the amount of lake frontage of these two tracts?

Mr. MILLER. I do not think it gives it exactly.

Mr. BRITTEN. Each tract has a frontage on Lake Washington of approximately 900 feet. That would be 1,800 feet.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a material factor in the valuation of property, when considering it for suburban usage.

Mr. BRITTEN. The committee was quite satisfied with this appraisal. We think it is quite reasonable.

Mr. MILLER. Generally lands abutting on this Lake Washington are considered choice residential properties.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How was the appraisal made?

Mr. MILLER. I did not have anything to do with it. I suppose it was made by the Bureau of Public Works of the Navy of that naval district.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I notice here in the report of the Acting Secretary of the Navy he says that while the Navy Department feels that the measure is very desirable and also necessary, yet on the other hand the expenditures involved would result in exceeding the total cost of the naval estimate to Congress for the next fiscal year, and that the Navy Department is, therefore, impelled to recommend against the enactment of the measure.

Mr. MILLER. The same question was asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The naval appropriation bill for the next fiscal year has been passed, and has been signed by the President. This would come in the following year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one hour.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, what I have to say about this bill is not in criticism of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] who introduced the bill and reported it, or of the committee. It is the function of Congress to legislate and to appropriate without any restriction or even consultation with anyone, if you please. We are entirely within our rights to act independently of the report from any department, if we so choose. However, I do criticize Cabinet officers who are not playing the game fairly. The President of the United States under the law operates under a Budget system. Members of the Cabinet belong to the President's family, and they should cooperate with the President in keeping within Budget limitations. I submit that a Cabinet officer who will send a report like the report accompanying the bill now before us is not playing the game. Surely he is not cooperating with his own administration in budgetary matters.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In just a moment. I am not criticizing the gentleman from Washington at all. The report urges the purchase of this land. It is a favorable report up to the last line when he says in effect, but this does not meet with the financial program of the President, using the usual phrase, and that, therefore, they are constrained to report against the favorable consideration of the bill. Those of us who follow legislation very closely are very often confronted with just this kind of a report, especially from the War Department and the Navy Department. First strong for the bill; in favor with the subject-matter of the bill praising it and then a line against passage of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman's idea is that a Cabinet officer ought not to have any views of his own, that he just ought to follow the Budget?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; those are not my views at all. He should be for or against a bill in making a report to Congress.

Mr. HASTINGS. And if he is against it he should give his reasons and not just say that it is against the financial program of the President.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. He can not be for it and against.

Mr. HASTINGS. There ought to be some reason for it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In this instance the Acting Secretary of the Navy gives one, two, three, four paragraphs in favor of the bill, and in the last paragraph he is against it. That is no help to Congress.

Mr. ABERNETHY. He has kept within the limits of the financial policy of the President, and therefore is saving his face.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly; and that is my objection. If he is against the passage of the bill for that or any other reason, let him so state. We are entitled to get the recommendations or the disapproval of the department. The ambiguity employed in this instance by the Navy Department is not helpful to Congress, and it is not helpful to the President.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman will recall by scrutinizing the dates of the report by the Assistant Secretary, and the others, that the date is before the passage of either the naval appropriation bill or the second deficiency bill, and would merely

indicate that it would exceed the limits this year, because those bills have now passed, and this would come in next year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The letter is dated April 4, 1930.

Mr. MILLER. That was before the passage of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Even so, that does not change the situation. It is very clear in this report that the Secretary of the Navy is apparently in favor of the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. MILLER. I guess he is.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If he is, he ought to stop there. He should not be for it and then recommend against it. That is my objection. I find this practice repeatedly in reports from departments. We get a sort of left-handed opposition. I think we should take a decided stand, reporting either for or against a given proposition.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. If I had my way about it, I would change the rules of the House and of the committee, and when a report of that kind comes saying that it is against the financial program of the President without detailed reasons I would send it back to them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, that is our privilege. The House has a great many powers that it does not exercise. We are entitled to get the views of the departments in aid of our work, and a report of this kind is of no value whatever.

Let me point out another situation. It was only Monday last under suspension of the rules that we passed the bill on the question of gifts of land. The last Calendar Wednesday of the Military Affairs Committee, there were two or three propositions where land was given and a field established, and then the proposition came in for additional necessary land, and in every instance at a very high price. This land was purchased for less than \$400,000, some 400 acres of it.

Mr. MILLER. About \$400,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. An average of about \$1,000 an acre.

Mr. MILLER. That was 12 years ago.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It has jumped. Now it is \$1,666 an acre. I am not questioning the value of the land. Of course, the Navy Department knows how to buy land, or it can resort to condemnation proceedings. I want to point out this, that any time the Government gets any land for nothing, rest assured they will be here in a short time asking that the Government buy additional land at high prices, and I call on the Committee on Appropriations to say if that is not so.

It is always desirable not have any obstacles in the approach to a flying field and to have long runways. I am not going into the merits of this particular proposition. I do want to go on record now as criticizing the heads of the departments. They should take a decided stand and recommend either favorable action or unfavorable action by Congress. Yet we find report after report, taking three-fourths or seven-eighths of their letters, in favor of a bill, and then a short closing statement recommending unfavorable action.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. KVALE. I have listened to the arguments this afternoon concerning the necessity of runways. But they have failed to show—and the hearings and report likewise fail to indicate—just what this acquisition means in added feet of runway or just how long these present runways are, Nos. 5 and 6. The gentleman knows that a field of 400 acres will provide runways not far from a mile in length. The addition of a field of 20 or 30 acres, with a lake frontage of 1,800 feet, would not seem to add materially to the length of the runway now existing. I think that is a fact, and hope the gentleman from New York, with his wide experience in aviation, will try to develop this information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With this land added, they will have a runway of over 5,000 feet. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] says, if they are flying bombing planes with full loads, they will need all the runway they can get.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I was trying to find out how long the runways were, but I can not find out.

Mr. BRITTEN. The addition of these two parcels will extend the flying lanes about 250 feet and 200 feet, respectively.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I told that to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE], but I think it does not fully answer. There you have five or six runways.

Mr. MILLER. How far a runway may go depends on the shape of the tract of land and also the prevailing direction of the wind.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Can the gentleman from Washington tell us how the present runways are constructed? Are they of gravel, cinder, or cement?

Mr. MILLER. They are of turf.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The reason I asked that question was that, in reply to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] stated that the cost of grading this land would be trivial. Personally, I believe and, particularly if there is a gravel pit there, that it will be a rather expensive job.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Washington, who is acquainted with the condition of the land, says there are no deep holes, and that it would be only a trifling operation to level off the gravel. If that is a fact, this is a good, economic proposition, and I rely on the information the gentleman has given as warrant for my attitude toward this bill.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will ask the gentleman from Washington what is the formation there?

Mr. MILLER. Sand and gravel.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is the drainage good?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. I will say, from information which I have obtained from my colleague from Washington [Mr. HADLEY], that the present runway is about 300 feet long.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The gentleman from Washington is justified in taking the floor and saying that the Navy Department has considered it and favors it. In the face of the report, he is justified in so presenting the bill to the House.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. PATTERSON. How long has it been since the original purchase was made?

Mr. MILLER. There was no original purchase. There was a donation. The donation was made about 12 years ago.

Mr. PATTERSON. Would it not be a good idea to put in this bill a provision to the effect that we would not accept an extension of these fields? Supposing they would be used for 25 years or 50 years, would it not be a good idea to prevent people from coming in and selling additional land in the vicinity?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The point I want to make is simply that if Congress is expected to work along with a Budget system, we should have all the information concerning the financial condition of the country as well as the financial program of the President. If a project is submitted to a department, Congress should have an unequivocal report either in favor or against the bill. If the department does not wish to make any recommendation, it can say so; but it should not first approve the bill in glowing terms of praise and then feebly recommend against its passage.

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman in his position regarding the Budget, but in this case I do not think he has made out a meritorious case. I think the Acting Secretary of the Navy has been absolutely fair in his position. As to whether this property should be acquired or not, I do not see how he could have written other replies than those which he wrote on January 8 in reply to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and the letter he wrote on April 4, 1930, in response to the inquiry of the chairman of the committee. He states in those two letters that this property is most valuable and necessary in connection with the enlargement of the present flying station located at Lake Washington. However, that station was established, and it is stated here that it was the result of a gift by Kings County, at an expense of \$4,000. We have to accept the proposition as it is. The Government owns the property. In a hearing as to additional fields for air stations and the proper sites for them on the Pacific coast made by the Committee on Military Affairs rather close consideration was given not only from the general standpoint but from the strategic standpoint, as, for instance, in the case of the Rockwell Field, near San Francisco.

Mr. SWING, Representative from the San Diego district, where we have large flying activities, came before the committee and spoke in advocacy of retaining the present naval site in the harbor of San Diego. The military tacticians of the Air Service pointed out the need of having our air bases not in the immediate vicinity of the coast but back from the coast, showing the need of their not being within the range of the gunfire of vessels, but having them in such localities where they could make an easy flight.

Now, it is uncontroverted that we have a limited field of 400 acres owned by the Government. It is proposed to add two additional tracts of 10 and 20 acres, respectively. Some objection has been raised. These two tracts, I take it from the pic-

ture presented to us by the gentlemen from Washington, are absolutely essential to increased efficiency of this air station. The addition of these two tracts will make the present station much more valuable than is expressed by the amount involved. Sometimes a little stretch of land 10 feet in width added to a stretch of land 40 feet wide more than doubles or trebles its efficiency. So the showing is made that because this land is on Lake Washington, practically in the line of the trade winds, it is of great value to this station to have this adjoining land, not only for the ease of making flight but, as has been pointed out by the testimony, to avoid the erection of buildings on these adjoining tracts, which would be an impediment in the flight of an airship. That is one potent argument that has been advanced.

Let us consider the price for a moment. I have not been on the coast since the time of the Pan American Pacific Exposition in 1915. I happened to visit Seattle on my return from the exposition at San Francisco. I went out and visited Lake Washington. I remember somewhat the topography about the shores of Lake Washington. I visited around the university one afternoon. In my mind I have a picture of the general lay of the land. That is why I inquired of the gentleman from Washington whether this was near the university grounds. Any person who has been to the city of Seattle knows that the growth of population in that hilly city is out toward Lake Washington for residence purposes. Anybody knows that 4 or 5 miles from the center of the business district is within the immediate environs of the city. What is \$1,500 an acre for suburban property, particularly if it has desirable lake frontage as this property has, 1,800 feet, more than a quarter of a mile?

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The last census revealed that in the immediate environs, just outside the city limits of Seattle, there lived 140,000 people; just outside the city limits.

Mr. STAFFORD. And what is the latest figure as to population of Seattle?

Mr. MILLER. Three hundred and sixty thousand in the city proper.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a population in the metropolitan area of 500,000.

As the chairman of the committee stated, anybody who is acquainted with the platting of property knows that you estimate eight lots to the acre. Two hundred dollars for a 25-foot front lot. You can not buy property 7 miles from the center of Milwaukee for anything like five times that amount for a lot, and in Chicago, ten times that amount. Any person who has visited the magic city of Detroit knows that property can not be bought there at any such price. The people who work in the River Rouge plant of Mr. Ford go 10 or 12 or 14 miles in their automobiles from their homes to Dearborn. It is the amazement of the development of industrial centers that so many persons employed in the industrial plants want a little plot of ground. It does not make any difference what character building they erect. It may be up on stilts, but they want a home. The safety and security of American life to-day is in American workers owning their own individual piece of land with their separate home. When they have a little piece of God's chosen land then you may know that no communistic agitation will swerve them from their desire to stand back of the United States Government. [Applause.] They become part and parcel of this Government anchored to the soil and interested in the maintenance of its institutions.

If I were a business man in charge of this proposition, with my vague knowledge of this property I would be willing to pay \$2,500 or \$3,000 an acre now. Ten years from now that land may be worth \$8,000, \$10,000, or more an acre, as similar property in suburban districts of our large industrial centers is worth. Seattle is growing. The testimony of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] shows there are 140,000 people in the suburban district. There is a great university situated near by. This property is valuable as suburban residence property. It is platted and staked off already. Are you going to buy it, or adopt a cheese-paring policy and let it go by? It is good business policy to buy it now and at a reasonable figure. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR].

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, the bill under consideration, as well as the previous bill, has for its object the acquiring of land by purchase or receiving it by gift for the erection of a hospital and also for the building of an airplane port. I want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that recently in Indiana there was a patriot, a gentleman, a man of wealth, a multimillionaire, who offered to give to the Federal

Government of the United States \$6,000,000 worth of property for any amount of money which the United States might want to pay for that ground. As you know, under recent authorizations hospitals are to be built all over this country, or at least in some of the States. There was an appropriation of \$500,000 authorized for Indiana. Mr. Edward Ballard, owner of the West Baden Hotel, offered to sell his property at such a low figure that it was practically a gift.

His property, which includes the West Baden Hotel, one of the health resorts of America, had surrounding it 800 acres of land and, as I said, it was valued at \$6,000,000. He carried insurance on the hotel property to the amount of \$2,000,000. So well constructed is the West Baden Hotel that he secured insurance to the amount of between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000 for an annual premium of \$6,000, or a premium which amounted to but \$1 on \$500 worth of insurance. So the building was well constructed. He offered, as I said, to give this to the Federal Government for a hospital for the veterans who are to be hospitalized in Indiana. His offer was turned down for two reasons. One reason was that it was not centrally located and the other reason was that by reason of its being remote and being among the southern hills of Indiana there was not a near-by city large enough to furnish physicians and surgeons who specialized in some particular disease or ailment which the soldiers might have.

This man was prompted in practically giving this property to the Federal Government—which was to be used in the beginning for a hospital and later to be converted into a soldiers' home—that it might forever remain an evidence of his patriotism to the Government of the United States under whose opportunities afforded he had amassed a fortune. While I have no criticism to make of the gentlemen selected by the Veterans' Bureau to say where the hospital should be located, I do not believe their objections were well founded because, as was stated by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC], it would not make much difference if the veterans had to go 100 or 200 miles farther in order to be properly cared for.

During the war this property was turned over to the Federal Government as a hospital and at one time it took care of as many as 900 patients. Mr. Ballard would have been willing to turn that property over to the Government within 10 days' time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. DUNBAR. It could immediately have been used for the purpose of a hospital for the veterans, not only in Indiana but from wherever they might be sent.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Was that to be a gift?

Mr. DUNBAR. It was to be given to the Government for any price the Government might want to give for it. If the Government wanted to give \$25,000 that would have been accepted.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. For the West Baden Hotel?

Mr. DUNBAR. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Did the offer include the water concession?

Mr. DUNBAR. The Pluto water is over at French Lick Springs, but French Lick and West Baden are only half a mile apart.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Was that to be given to the Government, too?

Mr. DUNBAR. No; that is a different proposition.

Mr. MILLER. That is one of the most famous health resorts in the country.

Mr. DUNBAR. In the whole world. It could have been turned over to the Government within 10 days' time, and later he wanted the property to be used for an old-soldiers' home.

I think the fact that Mr. Ballard's proposition was turned down by the committee appointed by the veterans' association should be known and that his patriotism, his liberality, and his munificence should also be known, and that a record of it should be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let me say a few words more. There is not a more healthful resort in the United States. You have all heard of the French Lick Springs. You have all heard of the West Baden Hotel. They are about one-half mile apart. French Lick Springs were owned by Thomas Taggart, that great captain of Democracy, and I want to tell you that every year just before or just after an election Tammany Hall of New York sent a carload of its chiefs out there in order that they might recuperate and be prepared for the battle to come or be reinvigorated after the battle was over. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have some time and I yield the gentleman five additional minutes. I want the gentleman to tell us more about Tammany Hall being rehabilitated, because I have wondered why they had so much strength.

Mr. BRITTEN. Tell us what else they shipped a carload of.

Mr. DUNBAR. Liquor was absolutely prohibited.

Mr. BRITTEN. I did not say anything about liquor.

Mr. DUNBAR. All alcoholic beverages were prohibited, and a man who went to the French Lick Springs or to the West Baden Hotel was warned that if he drank of the water that was furnished there and then drank alcoholic beverages his system would be so deranged that they would not be responsible for his health and perhaps they would have to take him away in a coffin before many days.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In other words, you can not use Pluto water for a highball? Is that correct? [Laughter.]

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman has stated it exactly. You can not use Pluto water for a highball.

Mr. BRITTEN. How does the gentleman know?

Mr. DUNBAR. It is in my district.

Mr. BRITTEN. What is?

Mr. DUNBAR. The French Lick Hotel and the West Baden Hotel.

Mr. BRITTEN. I thought the gentleman was talking about Pluto water.

Mr. DUNBAR. Pluto water is universally known among all the people of my district and throughout the world, and they know that Pluto water and alcoholic beverages are incompatible. For that reason these hotels have been used as a health resort.

Now, as I said, when Thomas Taggart was the owner of these French Lick Springs and a chief in the Democratic Party, no Democrat who, after an election, found his way to the French Lick Springs was allowed to go hungry, and that might be said of any Republican of note, because he was a prince of good fellows.

I will state that Mr. Ballard is a Republican, but has a Democratic associate. Somehow or other the Democrats used to flock there more than Republicans. Mr. Ballard is a man who has made a large amount of money. He wanted to perpetuate his name to be associated with patriotism. I wrote and told him that the Veterans' Bureau had refused his offer and I suggested that he devote it to some other philanthropic purpose. He wants to leave a monument. He wrote back to me that for the time being all offers had been withdrawn.

Now, my sole object in appearing before you to-day is to give testimony to the munificence of this patriotic man who wanted to provide a soldiers' home in the most beautifully located land in the United States, among the hills of southern Indiana, within 30 miles of where Abraham Lincoln was reared to manhood, where Walter Gresham was born, where George Rogers Clark lived the greater portion of his life, where William H. English, the Democratic candidate for Vice President in 1880, was born, within 15 miles of where John Hay, secretary to Abraham Lincoln, was born—all among the hills of southern Indiana. The hills there are conducive to the development of character and the promotion of health, and to everything essential to enable any of the veterans who might be sent there as sick men to recuperate and recover their health. It was then to be converted later on into an old-soldiers' home with 800 acres of land. Mr. LA GUARDIA, there would never have been any demand for more land there. It could have been converted into a wonderful old-soldiers' home, but this man's patriotism was not recognized and his offer was turned down.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, what was the reason for not accepting this offer?

Mr. DUNBAR. The reason it was not accepted, as I have stated, was that it is not near the central part of the State, and another reason was that being located, as it were, in the wilds of Indiana, among the hills, physicians and surgeons especially for any one particular ailment, could not be secured in the required length of time.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman does not mean to intimate that General Hines had in mind anything about the wild men of the West, when you speak of the wilds of Indiana?

Mr. DUNBAR. It was not General Hines alone. There was a committee of six or eight men who passed upon it. My object is not to criticize General Hines or to criticize the selection of any other site, but only to give testimony to the liberality and patriotism of Mr. Edward Ballard, of West Baden, Ind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON] having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill S. 3341, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE AT HONOLULU

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1222) to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill, the Senate bill S. 2834, which is an identical bill now on the Speaker's table.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that there are some Members of the House who wish to contest the passage of this bill very earnestly. I regard this as unnecessary.

Mr. BRITTEN. The Senate bill is identical, and I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1222) to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish a branch hydrographic office at Honolulu, in the Territory of Hawaii, the same to be conducted under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to establish a hydrographic office in the Navy Department," approved June 21, 1866.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to secure sufficient accommodations in said city of Honolulu for said hydrographic office and to provide the same with the necessary furniture, apparatus, supplies, and services allowed existing branch hydrographic offices, at a cost not exceeding \$5,000, which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for these purposes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. HOUSTON].

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, this bill is for the purpose of establishing a branch hydrographic office at Honolulu. Congress maintains at Washington a hydrographic office and at other cities certain branch hydrographic offices for the purpose of promoting general maritime security.

The Hydrographic Office collects information and prints four thousand and odd charts that cover the sea areas of the world, excepting those which refer to our own domestic coasts. The Coast and Geodetic Survey has by direction of the Congress the authority and the duty of providing for the latter.

The Hydrographic Office collects, translates, and has published in the English language 58 volumes of sailing directions, 6 volumes of light lists, that cover all of the oceans of the world, radio aids, navigation, and naval air pilots and pilot charts.

It is the maintenance of this establishment which makes it possible for the American merchant marine, as well as the American Navy, to navigate the seven seas.

These branch hydrographic offices are authorized by Congress and are located at the present time—7 on the Atlantic seaboard, 2 upon the Gulf coast, 5 at Lake ports, and only 4 on the Pacific coast. This additional branch hydrographic office at Honolulu would only make five branches on the Pacific and in the Pacific.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield? What other function does this branch hydrographic office provide except to give out charts and information?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It maintains in its office a complete set of the 4,000 charts corrected to date. Light lists corrected; also 58 volumes of sailing directions, which cover all the

waters of the world, similarly corrected; and collects information that is brought in by ships. It disseminates the information to the navigators of ships that pass through the port.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Is there not a naval officer at Honolulu assigned to that duty?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. There is one officer assigned to that duty, but with other duties also; but with a port the size of Honolulu it requires more than that. Last year the island ports were visited by about 10,700,000 tons of shipping, and through it passed American commerce exceeding \$1,800,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering why the charts and sailing directions there under the control of this naval officer is not sufficient?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. At the present time the charts are there, but the corrections have not been made for lack of personal assistance. The notations are made but the corrections are not made.

Mr. TABER. I was wondering what functions would be promoted by this hydrographic office?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. There would be stationed in the office what is known as a naval expert, under the civil service, whose sole duty it is to keep that office up to date, and the charts corrected and become available for the information of the navigator and seagoing men who may consult them.

Mr. TABER. Is not this man available for that now?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. He can not do all the work; it is impossible.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from the Hawaiian Islands himself was assigned to that work once, was he not?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I had that office in addition to my other duties as captain of the yard at Pearl Harbor. I was stationed at Pearl Harbor, 8 miles away, and I had to come up every day, make the trip to Honolulu and go back to Pearl Harbor.

Mr. TABER. There is no such office in Panama or the Philippines?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. At Panama there is a hydrographic office carried on by the Panama Canal authorities, and I think with a naval officer at the head of it.

Mr. TABER. How about Manila?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. There is none at Manila, so far as I know.

Mr. TABER. Is navigation embarrassed because we do not have that hydrographic office at Honolulu at the present time?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That is putting it perhaps the wrong way. I can not positively say that navigation is embarrassed. Navigation will be much safeguarded if this bill is enacted, and the personnel and the corrected material will always and instantly be available to the seagoing people.

Mr. TABER. Does this mean that they come in and go out of Honolulu so quickly that they are not available under the present method of operation?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. The average vessel that is in the trans-Pacific trade or going from north to south in the Pacific comes in in the morning and leaves that afternoon.

Mr. TABER. Does not that mean that they have an opportunity of going there and consulting the charts, if they care to?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. They always have the time if they can take it, but one part of one day is not very much time when you must consider that they have other duties to perform.

Mr. TABER. Would they do any different than they do now?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. If they feel that in going to that office they will have to wait a considerable time until the chart has been corrected, they may not take advantage of the restricted facilities which exist there. Here is a statement which bears on the subject. Assuming for a minute that the hydrographic office were discontinued, at the end of one year about 2,500,000 copies of essential security information would be lacking, and 1,000,000 changes on charts would be missing. There are 4,000 obstructions or rocks that were never known before that are reported on the average each year.

Mr. TABER. Does the branch office correct these things?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It does.

Mr. TABER. Are they not all corrected here in Washington?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. They are.

Mr. TABER. And sent out, so that the charts are kept substantially up to date?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. When a sufficient number of corrections have been made to a chart in Washington, a new edition is gotten out. In the meantime the corrections are indicated in what are known as Notices to Mariners. These notices are sent out weekly and daily, and it is the function

of the branch hydrographic offices to correct their own charts so that they may be up to date when a navigator comes in. Navigators also get these information bulletins.

Mr. TABER. These navigators are supplied with these hydrographic charts, as I understand it. They buy them at a small fee?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Oh, these charts are sold at cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. TABER. And these navigators go into the hydrographic offices at San Francisco, say, or San Diego or Seattle, and keep their charts up to date before they start, so that there is very little unless it is absolutely current information that they need. Is not that about so?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. They usually have the charts upon the regular runs which they follow, but there is a mass of shipping that is on charter. That shipping naturally does not carry all of the charts of the world, and they may go into a port and unload their cargo and then receive a charter to go to some port of the world for which they have no charts, and then they must obtain those charts locally and compare them.

Mr. BRITTEN. In line with the gentleman's question I offer this thought, that mariners from all over the world, not only Americans but from all over the world, on tramp steamers, change their destination very frequently when they get out to sea, and they want to know that they can get sufficient charts and sufficient information at Honolulu, or at least if they do know it they will go in there with much greater ease and comfort than if they do not know it. This branch hydrographic office is not being suggested merely for American mariners, but it is for the mariners of the world. It will be very inexpensive. It will cost, according to the estimate of the naval authorities, \$1,680 a year for help, and nothing else except for a little rent, and a thousand dollars to furnish the office. Then every mariner in the world who knows anything about the work of the branch hydrographic office will know that a very good one exists at Honolulu. As a shipping point Honolulu is the most important point in the world, and the committee was so impressed. I am certain there was a unanimous report upon this bill after having heard the Hydrographic Office in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. And in order that it may be of record now, inasmuch as the Senate bill was objected to, I would state that an identical bill has already passed the Senate, and I read from the Senate committee in reporting the bill:

The committee believes that notwithstanding the unfavorable report of the department, which was due simply to the Budget, the bill is necessary in order that this country may continue its aid and assistance in the development of the merchant marine.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. While the gentleman was in charge of this substitute service in connection with the Navy at Honolulu did he have occasion to make any reports to the head office as to obstructions to navigation?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. In what locality?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. In Pacific waters.

Mr. STAFFORD. Whereabouts?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. If the gentleman will pardon me, that was about four years ago, and I can not go into great detail.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can understand that the person in charge of the hydrographic office at Seattle has frequent occasion to report to the head office at Washington as to unknown obstructions to navigation in Alaskan waters, but it is difficult for me to conceive of such conditions existing in the waters tributary to or leading out of Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. As the gentleman will remember, Honolulu is a meeting point for trade routes coming from South America and the Panama Canal and San Pedro, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and Los Angeles, besides Manila and Shanghai and Hong Kong, Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of this bill is to make this port an aid to navigation?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes. I gave the gentleman an answer and said that I had made some investigation, but I could not give a definite answer beyond that. There are buoys and floating spars and matters of that kind that are frequently reported adrift, and the information respecting them is very necessary to shipping. Many merchant ships are not yet fitted with radio, because foreign law does not require it in all cases,

and when they obtain information they turn it into the branch hydrographic office and from there it is turned into the Navy Department.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I would like the gentleman to tell us just how the hydrographic office at Honolulu operates at the present time. For instance, is there an office at Honolulu, or simply an office at Pearl Harbor where the mariners have to report to get their information?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. No. The office is at Honolulu, or it was when I was there.

Mr. TABER. Where is it at the present time?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It may have been changed from Honolulu.

Mr. TABER. The charts were there and all the data which would be used to bring the charts up to date?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. TABER. So that anyone could refer to those charts and secure all the information?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Do they keep open at regular office hours?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes. The office is open during regular office hours.

Mr. TABER. What are those hours?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. The office is kept open as long as there is shipping. We used an enlisted man because we had no legislative authority for civilian employees, and that man would go and visit the ships. As soon as there were ships he would go down to the ships and collect the data and bring it up to us.

Mr. TABER. So that the work has been done and is now being done as it would be done under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Only in part.

Mr. TABER. Except the point of keeping all the charts up to date?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That is all.

Mr. TABER. The notes are there and the information is all there?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes. The duty of the nautical experts is to keep up with the modern methods. The Hydrographic Office here issues new books for the purpose of aiding navigation. Its reports go out there, and the nautical experts give assistance as to how those methods shall be used. Now, it is not possible to do that when the officer is not there himself.

Mr. TABER. That officer in the customhouse is equipped with a certain amount of furniture and apparatus necessary to take care of these charts and other things, is he?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes; it is loaned from the navy yard.

Mr. TABER. But it is not being used or required for anything else in the navy yard?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It might be, yes.

Mr. TABER. Why?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Because of the operations down there.

Mr. TABER. You mean they have this furniture and equipment up at the customhouse, and even if it is not required at the navy yard it would still be up at the navy yard?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It is part of their outfit. They might loan it, or they might not.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Surely.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact that the present situation in Honolulu is a makeshift rather than what might be called a good business office for carrying this information for the benefit of mariners from all over the world?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I have tried to indicate that, because it was my experience at the time. I tried to indicate that it was very much of a makeshift, and that the conditions would be materially changed if it were made regular.

Mr. MILLER. And it is universally recognized and recommended by everybody?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact that we are aiming to do to-day what Great Britain has done in most ports of the world when they disseminate charts issued in Great Britain as well as in the United States?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I believe so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think they have experts there at all. The gentleman says the idea is to have this office there in order to have a competent person in charge?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes; to have him always in the office.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. An expert on this subject?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The report here says that the experts get only \$1,600 a year.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. He will get the rate that is provided for, the rate provided for the schedule. I think they get more than that now. I think they get \$1,860.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe that a naval officer is better qualified to give information to a navigator than a \$1,600 clerk?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Well, he is there all the time; yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. A naval officer has other duties at Pearl Harbor, for instance?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Yes. While I was there I was at Pearl Harbor more than half the time, and the other part of the day at the other place, to conduct the administrative business of the office.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All of the ships going through Honolulu—

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. They are doing business with an enlisted man.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, they provide themselves with charts before leaving?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Sometimes new charts come out and they do not always have the charts.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that these changes do not happen overnight, very often, in regular lanes of navigation.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Changes of charts come out quite frequently. Information regarding changes on charts that must be made come out almost daily.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Such as changes of lights in a port?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Changes with respect to facilities at the ports; changes with respect to dangers in ports; changes with respect to depth of water in ports; information with respect to tidal waves, and all sorts of information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does that not come out in regular bulletin form?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That comes out in regular bulletin form, and it comes out by radio broadcast also, but the ships do not always get it, and they want to come to the office and check up to see that they have got it all.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then the main question is whether this bureau is in charge of a \$1,600 clerk or a sailor or a commissioned officer, to hand out these bulletins along with the chart?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Oh, no. It is to consult the charts and compare their charts with the office chart to see whether theirs is in agreement with the standard material that has been received. It must be remembered that often in the transmission of radio information mistakes are made, and the ships may not get it correctly, whereas the big station at Oahu undoubtedly has got things correctly, because it is checked back and forth.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would rather leave these corrections and annotations under the direction of a naval officer than under the direction of a \$1,600 clerk.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Surely; but there will be a naval officer in addition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to try to get a picture of the actual operations when the gentleman was in charge. The gentleman says that the only obstructions he reported when he was in charge of the office were some floating spars.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. No, no. I did not say those were the only ones.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the gentleman learned from some incoming navigator there was a floating spar at sea, what was the routine by which a report was made?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I sent it out as a bulletin over radio broadcast. It was sent as information to the Hydrographic Office in Washington and to the coast.

Mr. STAFFORD. There would be no added facilities for safeguarding navigation if a separate office were established there by reason of broadcasting that information?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It would be recorded and corrected on the charts, and those charts are available instantly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman to say he corrected those charts?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. I did not say that.

Mr. STAFFORD. How would the chart be corrected?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. It would not be corrected in that local office at the present time. An index of its correction would only be made.

Mr. STAFFORD. In Washington, at the head office, or at the local office?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. At the local office.

Mr. STAFFORD. You would change all charts to show there was a floating spar out at sea at some latitude and longitude?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. If the gentleman will listen—

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been listening attentively. I want to see some reason for establishing this branch office.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. There are about 4,000 charts covering waters other than the domestic waters. Those are published by this Hydrographic Office. There is an index or chart catalogue made of those charts and it is in the chart catalogue that the corrections are indicated. Then when a man wants to refer to a certain chart you look up the number and refer to the chart catalogue and see what corrections will have to be made before that chart is up to date. As far as possible, the local office, with the office force that is available, tries to correct only the local charts; but all of the others are simply indicated as corrections to be made in the chart catalogue.

Does that cover the gentleman's point?

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, of course, it covers it quite generally; but still I am seeking information as to what the real purpose, as an aid to navigation, would be by establishing a distinct office at Honolulu.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Well, I tried to make that clear.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including the Senate committee report on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[S. Rept. No. 464, 71st Cong., 2d sess.]

ESTABLISH A HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE AT HONOLULU, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 2834):

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2834) to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Provision by law is made at the present time for hydrographic stations at the following ports: Boston, Mass.; New York, N. Y.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md.; Norfolk, Va.; Savannah, Ga.; New Orleans, La.; Galveston, Tex.; San Juan, P. R.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Cleveland, Ohio; Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Duluth, Minn.; San Francisco, Calif.; Portland, Oreg.; Seattle, Wash.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Detroit, Mich.

Honolulu, as has been well said, is the crossroads of the Pacific. The shipping passing through the port has increased in 28 years a matter of 1,700 per cent. The gross tonnage of arrivals and departures of overseas vessels at Honolulu in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, was 7,052,907 tons, an increase of 860,196 tons over the preceding year. In addition to that overseas tonnage, there were arrivals and departures of interisland vessels to a gross tonnage of 1,053,968 tons, making a total tonnage coming into the port during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1928, of 8,106,875 tons.

In addition to that, there was a tonnage of two million, six hundred thousand and odd overseas ships which arrived and departed at other island ports not listed in the above total.

The after-war trade of the United States with South America was \$2,500,000 a year. Then we began to develop our merchant marine, and now the American trade with South America is \$1,000,000,000 a year. The trade with China, which passes through Honolulu, has likewise developed to a remarkable degree, increasing from three and a half million dollars a year to \$1,800,000,000, with 80 American ships involved.

Trade routes are concentrated at Honolulu from South American ports, the Panama Canal, San Pedro, San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and British Columbia. And from Honolulu they radiate to New Zealand, Australia, Samoa, and Fiji, the Philippine Islands, China, and Japan.

The Hydrographic Office in the Navy Department carries about 4,000 charts referring to all the foreign ports of the world. At the Hydrographic Office these charts must be kept corrected in order that they may be referred to by captains and navigators of the merchant vessels calling at the port. Last year alone, for instance, there were 4,000 rocks discovered that nobody had known anything about, and there were many other changes.

It is the function of the Hydrographic Office at ports of call, such as this, to collect early information made available by ships during the course of their voyages, some of which ships do not carry radio, which information is thereafter transmitted by radio to Washington and broadcast, if necessary, as soon as received. The port offices invite visits from the seaman and navigator in order to check their charts and to avail themselves of the latest Notices to Mariners and sailing

directions. Many ships, particularly those on charter, naturally do not carry a world supply of charts; they may have delivered a cargo at Honolulu and then received orders to proceed to a part of the world whose charts they have not got. The Hydrographic Office is there to advise them as to charts necessary and sailing directions that may be required; and the office likewise sees to it that the agent for the sale of charts maintains a suitable stock which by comparison with the office charts may be corrected before sale to individual ships.

The committee feels that notwithstanding the unfavorable report of the department, which was due simply to the Budget's attitude, that the bill is necessary in order that this country may continue its aid and assistance in the development of the merchant marine.

The following is the action of the Navy Department upon the bill:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 14, 1930.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Replying further to the committee's communication dated January 7, 1930, transmitting the bill (S. 2834) to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and requesting the views of the Navy Department relative to this measure, I have the honor to inform the committee as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a branch hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and to appropriate \$5,000 to provide, furnish, equip, and maintain such an office.

The bill carried \$5,000 for the outfitting of this office, which is considered sufficient. In addition to this figure it would be necessary to employ one nautical expert at \$1,680 per annum, which figure is considered the lowest at which a suitable person could be employed, considering the cost of living at Honolulu. It is considered that a suitable office within convenient proximity to the shipping interests could be obtained for \$1,000 per annum or possibly somewhat less. However, the cost of employment of the nautical expert and the rental cost for office space are annual appropriation charges.

A similar bill, H. R. 1222, was referred to the Bureau of the Budget with the above information. Under date of May 31, 1929, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised the Navy Department that the expenditure contemplated by this proposed legislation is not in accord with the financial program of the President. The bill S. 2834 is similar in language to the bill H. R. 6917, introduced in the Seventieth Congress.

In view of the foregoing the Navy Department recommends against the enactment of the bill S. 2834.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST LEE JAHNCKE,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the bill.

Only a small amount is involved in the consideration of the present bill. There is a matter of principle involved. Perhaps I am in error in the position I take. I have some information since the bill was brought under consideration different from that which I gleaned when I read the report.

The committee will notice that these hydrographic offices are located in only those American ports on the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, and the Pacific coast where navigation arrives or departs. You will notice that on the Atlantic coast there are some ports where ocean navigation departs which do not have a hydrographic office. For instance, Portland, Me., is a seaport where steamers depart without touching any other point on the coast. When I read the names of the cities on the Atlantic coast which have these stations the House will see that they have been established at the leading seaport points: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, and Savannah. On the Gulf coast, New Orleans and Galveston. There comes to mind, as far as the Gulf coast is concerned, a port from which Gulf steamers depart, namely, Mobile, which perhaps should have a hydrographic office.

Mr. COLLINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. COLLINS. What about New Orleans?

Mr. STAFFORD. New Orleans has a hydrographic office. We know that Gulf steamers go from New Orleans to Panama and to South American and Cuban ports. I believe the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR] will confirm that.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. To all ports of the world. It is the second largest port in the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a greater port than I thought it was. On the Lakes, Buffalo, Cleveland, Chicago, Duluth, and Detroit.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. And, in addition, Sault Ste. Marie and Cleveland.

Mr. STAFFORD. Sault Ste. Marie and Cleveland. Persons acquainted with the navigation on the Lakes know that there are steamer routes which emanate from those ports.

Nearly every steamer that comes into my home city generally touches at one of those other ports to get hydrographic maps. So there is no need to have a hydrographic office at Milwaukee, at Manitowoc, at Port Washington, across the lake at Muskegon, or at Ludington, because the steamers that leave from those ports touch at other ports where they can get these maps.

On the Pacific coast we have stations located at Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. We all know they are the main ports on the Pacific coast, from which navigation departs.

Now comes the question as to whether there is any need to have a branch station at Honolulu. There is a station on the Isthmus at which this service can be obtained. I do not believe there is any kind of navigation on the Pacific that does not stop at Panama or at these other Pacific coast ports in going to Honolulu. If that premise is not correct—

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That premise is incorrect.

Mr. STAFFORD. If that premise is incorrect, I wish to be corrected. What lanes of travel are there which do not touch at any of the Pacific ports mentioned and then touch at Honolulu?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. The gentleman is incorrect with respect to the Isthmus of Panama.

Mr. STAFFORD. I now yield to the gentleman to correct me. What lanes of travel on the Pacific which stop at Honolulu do not touch either Panama, San Diego, San Francisco, Portland, or Seattle?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. That is a very different statement. I accept that statement, though lanes come to and from Australia and British Columbia that do not go to other American ports.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman admits it. If that is the case, I will say that the original position I took is secure. I was fearful that perhaps there might be some lane of travel where steamers would not touch at some of these ports which have these hydrographic offices, where maps are distributed for the benefit of navigation. I can see the need of a hydrographic office at Manila. There is need for one there because navigation originates in Manila which may not have had the benefit of stopping at some of these other ports, but it is difficult for me to see why we should establish a separate hydrographic office at Honolulu in order to distribute maps, when every American steamer and every foreign steamer which so desires can secure those same maps at some already established American port before it reaches Honolulu. We know that certain steamers are not permitted, because of our intercoastal navigation laws, to stop at Honolulu—that is, steamers plying between Pacific ports and the Orient are not permitted to stop at Honolulu.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. There is no such difficulty. They can stop if they choose, but they can not carry cargoes between the coastal ports.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are privileged to stop, but I will say to the gentleman, who has first-hand information, that they do not stop there to get these hydrographic maps, because they get them before they leave.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. But it can readily be understood that they might want to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD. As a matter of practice, do not they obtain these maps before they leave the port of departure?

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Generally so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then this is merely supplementary to the service they can now obtain and do obtain at the ports of departure on the Pacific coast?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is entirely correct with reference to the Pacific coast, but what about the fellow who starts in India, in Africa, in Asia, or Australia? He is bound for some place in the Northwest of our country; he goes into Honolulu, and he wants additional charts and additional information. Why not provide a little office where he can get these maps, where the office will be efficient, just as is the case in the various ports of the United States? The gentleman is entirely correct when he is talking about a ship leaving San Francisco. Of course, such a ship can get the charts, but what about the fellow who is coming to San Francisco from Australia?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will answer the gentleman. The gentleman from Illinois has been much more of a navigator around the world than I have been. He makes annual trips to Europe, but it has not been my good fortune to even see European shores up to this time.

The gentleman comes from a port on the great unsalted sea and he knows that there is not a steamer leaving any port on the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, or the Pacific coast that has not in its possession these charts. These are given virtually free to all of them.

Everyone who has served in this House knows that the Hydrographic Office for the last 25 or 30 years has been seeking to spread its activities. Now, is there any justification for the establishment of this office at Honolulu? I would say there is need for the establishment of such an office at Manila, but it has been shown by the arguments here that there is no need for such an office at Honolulu.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. The hearings, at page 1251, show the following question by the chairman:

So that the Navy Department was in favor of the measure provided it was not in conflict with the financial program of the President?

Admiral LEIGH (Chief of the Bureau of Navigation). Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I do not deny for a minute that the Navy Department likes to have its attachés in all the courts of Europe, and certainly at Honolulu, having such an equable climate, and it would be fine to have a domicile there for one of its officers. I have been to Honolulu and I know the social life there. It appeals strongly to the naval and military officers, and why not. I am not surprised that the Navy Department wishes to have a headquarters for some of its epauleted, fine appearing officers. Naturally, the Navy would be in favor of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read the bill for amendment.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON] having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1222) to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 1222) was passed, and that the Senate bill (S. 2834) may be substituted therefor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the proceedings had on the bill (H. R. 1222) be vacated, and that the Senate bill (S. 2834) be substituted and passed. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, although the vote by which the House bill was passed was very close, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill (S. 2834), as follows:

S. 2834

An act to establish a hydrographic office at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to establish a branch hydrographic office at Honolulu, in the Territory of Hawaii, the same to be conducted under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to establish a hydrographic office in the Navy Department," approved June 21, 1866.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to secure sufficient accommodations in said city of Honolulu for said hydrographic office and to provide the same with the necessary furniture, apparatus, supplies, and services allowed existing branch hydrographic offices, at a cost not exceeding \$5,000, which sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for these purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, in order to try the patience of the House, I have one small bill which is unimportant which I would like to call up. It is H. R. 7639, and changes the language slightly in the six months' gratuity.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. It does not change it slightly; it takes away the discretion from the Comptroller General.

Mr. GARNER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question: Does he expect to use next Wednesday for his committee?

Mr. BRITTEN. A portion of the time.

Mr. GARNER. Would the gentleman be willing to put in the RECORD the bills that he intends to consider next Wednesday, so that the House may have knowledge of it?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes; one will be the bill that was objected to to-day on account of the report not complying with the Ramseyer rule, and there may be an oil conservation bill for the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BRITTEN. I yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman from Texas any idea that before next Tuesday some resolution for adjournment may be presented to the House?

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman standing up there under the flag can tell you more about that than I can. I have been wanting to adjourn for a good while.

Mr. BRITTEN. Do I understand the gentleman from Texas wishes me to insert in the RECORD the information I have given him?

Mr. GARNER. It would be informative to know what the gentleman is going to call up next Wednesday.

Mr. BRITTEN. Very well.

H. R. 1190. Line promotion bill.

H. R. 7934. Conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves.

H. R. 12964. To authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels.

H. R. 7639. To amend an act authorizing payment of six months' death gratuity.

H. R. 10296. U. S. S. *Olympia* as a memorial.

Senate Joint Resolution 140. Memorial tablet at Naval Academy, S-4.

S. 525. Silver service, *New Orleans*.

S. 3893. Silver service, *South Dakota*.

H. R. 11367. Certain public works at Parris Island.

H. R. 7974. To regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE OCONEE RIVER AT BALLS FERRY, GA.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Speaker's table the bill S. 4606, a bridge bill, and put it upon its passage, a similar bill being on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 4606) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Georgia and the counties of Wilkinson, Washington, and Johnson to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Oconee River at or near Balls Ferry, Ga.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of Georgia and the counties of Wilkinson, Washington, and Johnson to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Oconee River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Balls Ferry, Georgia, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

STATISTICS AS TO THE NUMBER OF PERSONS UNEMPLOYED

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill S. 3061, to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913, to provide for the statistics of the number of persons employed.

Mr. GREEN. Does that bill come from the Labor Committee?

Mr. KOPP. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill S. 3059, a labor bill from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday of this week it may be in order to consider bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to in the House as in Committee of the Whole, commencing with the star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that it may be in order on Friday next to consider bills unobjected to on the Private Calendar, commencing with the star, and that the bills be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to having a day of this week given over to the consideration of the Private Calendar, but the question in my mind is this: Suppose the deficiency appropriation bill should not be finished by to-morrow evening, which is not likely, should we go ahead with the deficiency bill on Friday?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. As I understand it, the order is merely that it may be in order to consider the Private Calendar on that day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I have no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois tell us what we are going to do on Saturday?

Mr. IRWIN. I have not any knowledge of what is going to happen on Saturday. I merely submit my request for Friday.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not going to object to the gentleman's request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to state just what business will be transacted on Saturday, but he is sure that something will be done to expedite the business of the House in an orderly manner.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the request of the gentleman from Illinois is that on Friday it may be in order to consider the Private Calendar?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. And to begin at the star?

Mr. IRWIN. Yes; where we left off.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman from Illinois hope to get through with the bills reported up to June 1 on Friday next?

Mr. IRWIN. I would like to say that I hope to do so. There is quite a number on the calendar, and if we get along fairly well we will be able to get through the most of them. I do not know that we will be able to get through all of the bills reported up to the 1st of June, but we will certainly do our best.

Mr. GARNER. I understand that the majority leader has assured the House of Representatives that he would during this session of Congress call the Private Calendar to include all bills reported up to the 1st of June. If the gentleman does not get through on Friday with those bills, I suggest that he consult the majority leader with a view of carrying out that promise.

Mr. IRWIN. I shall be very glad to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OPINION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RELATIVE TO MILITARY PREFERENCE

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a copy of the Attorney General's opinion interpreting an Executive order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Which Executive order?

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. The Executive order of the late President Harding as amended by former President Coolidge, relating to veterans in civilian employ of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of an opinion of the Attorney General interpreting an Executive order:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., December 4, 1929.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of a letter of August 9, 1929, with inclosures, requesting my opinion upon the question whether the Executive order of March 2, 1929, for-

bids the furloughing by the commandant of the Boston Navy Yard of an employee entitled to military preference in appointment, who has a rating of "good" or better, when a competing employee not entitled to military preference in appointment and having the same efficiency rating is retained.

This Executive order provides:

"In harmony with statutory provisions, when reductions are being made in the force in any part of the classified service, no employee entitled to military preference in appointment shall be discharged or dropped or reduced in rank or salary if his record is good or if his efficiency rating is equal to that of any employee in competition with him who is retained in the service."

This order amends Rule XII, paragraph 5, promulgated on March 3, 1923, merely by adding the words in italics above.

Military preference in appointment is provided for in section 6 of the act of March 3, 1919, chapter 97 (40 Stat. 1293), as amended by the act of July 11, 1919, chapter 6 (41 Stat. 37; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 35), in the following language:

"* * * in making appointments to clerical and other positions in the executive branch of the Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, and widows of such, and to the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold such positions."

The question is whether a person who is furloughed is "discharged or dropped or reduced in rank or salary" within the meaning of the Executive order of March 2, 1929.

Section 21 of Civil Service Commission Form No. 505, entitled "Furloughs," provides:

"No mention is made of furloughs in the civil service law or rules. In most of the departments regulations have been promulgated prescribing the conditions under which furloughs may be granted, the maximum period in any such regulations being three years. Furlough regulations are restricted in their application almost wholly to positions of skilled laborers and mechanics in the navy yards, arsenals, and other manufacturing or industrial establishments, and to a limited number of positions where the work is of an intermittent character."

"The power to furlough exists as an incident of the power of removal and is exercised for economical, as distinguished from disciplinary, reasons. The procedure required by statute in the case of removal is not necessary."

Civil Service Form No. 2009, as recently revised by representatives of the Navy Department and the Civil Service Commission, provides:

"As furlough does not involve discharge or separation from the service, military preference is not considered in making selections for furloughs."

Although the view of the Navy Department is entitled to great weight, it is not necessarily conclusive, and I am of the opinion that the Civil Service Commission is not given final authority to pass upon the question. I find nothing in 26 Op. 260 or in 28 Op. 395 to the contrary.

The policy of the statutes and orders relating to the civil service has been to give preference to persons honorably discharged from military and naval service in appointment and certain kinds of discharges and reductions. The same considerations would seem to apply to furloughs, and, in the absence of very clear language, I believe that no statute or Executive order should be construed to provide a different practice in regard to furloughs. Even without resort to these considerations, I am of the opinion that a person who is furloughed is "discharged or dropped or reduced in rank or salary." A furlough in the sense used here is a compulsory leave of absence without pay. The Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia, Volume IV, page 2414, defines the word as "the temporary discharge from service of a civilian in the employ of the Government." In *United States v. Murray* (100 U. S. 536, 538) the Supreme Court said that a furlough "is in effect a partial dismissal."

I therefore have the honor to advise you that in my opinion the Executive order of March 2, 1929, forbids the furloughing of an employee under the circumstances mentioned.

Respectfully,

WM. D. MITCHELL,
Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. WAINWRIGHT, for the balance of the week, on account of illness in his family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 3064. An act to make permanent the additional office of district judge created for the eastern district of Illinois by the act of September 14, 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4400. An act to legalize a pier constructed in Chesapeake Bay at Annapolis Roads, Md., and to legalize an intake pipe in Warren Cove, at Plymouth, Mass.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 19, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, June 19, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

For the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves (H. R. 7934).

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

To provide for blue dress uniforms for enlisted men of the Regular Army (H. R. 12876).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

553. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on Salt River, Ky., covering navigation, flood control, power development, and irrigation (H. Doc. No. 477); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

554. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a bill to authorize the Comptroller General of the United States to settle, adjust, and certify to Congress the claim of Alexander H. Bright or damage to his Moth airplane amounting to \$573.50; to the Committee on Claims.

555. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report to Congress concerning claim of Leslie W. Morse, formerly private, Company A, One hundred and fortieth Infantry, in the sum of \$20 as reimbursement for money sent to him in registered letter by his father, Fred Morse, on April 20, 1918, which letter has never been received by him; to the Committee on War Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12801. A bill to extend the provisions of the forest exchange act to public lands within 10 miles of the boundaries of the Whitman National Forest in the State of Oregon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. H. J. Res. 372. A joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to accept on behalf of the United States a conveyance of certain lands on Government Island from the city of Alameda, Calif., in consideration of the relinquishment by the United States of all its rights and interest under a lease of such island dated July 5, 1918; with amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUTLER: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 3557. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain timberlands and the sale thereof to the State of Oregon for recreational and scenic purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 325. An act for the relief of former Lieut. Col. Timothy J. Powers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 834. A bill for the relief of John W. Barnum; without amendment (Rept. No. 1951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Harris Smith, with amendment (Rept. No. 1952). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5314. A bill for the relief of W. A. Blankenship; with amendment (Rept. No. 1953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7520. A bill for the relief of the estate of Clarendon Davis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWBOTTOM: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8172. A bill to extend the benefits of an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," to William T. Roche; with amendment (Rept. No. 1955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOXEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9244. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay to R. B. Baugh, M. D., certain money due him for services rendered as a member of the local board of Smith County, Miss., operated during the World War; without amendment (Rept. 1956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Lynch; with amendment (Rept. No. 1957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARRETT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 489. A bill for the relief of John F. Hatfield; with amendment (Rept. No. 1958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Dowd; without amendment (Rept. No. 1959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2297. A bill for the relief of Frederick Rupp; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10728. A bill for the relief of John Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GUYER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4112. A bill for the relief of Senelma Wirkkula, also known as Selma Wirkkula; Alice Marie Wirkkula; and Bernice Elaine Wirkkula; with amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARRETT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 390. A bill for the relief of Harry E. Hale; with amendment (Rept. No. 1967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARRETT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 447. A bill to correct the military record of Patrick H. H. Snodgrass; with amendment (Rept. No. 1968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GARRETT: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 4674. A bill for the relief of John P. Leonard; with amendment (Rept. No. 1969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPEAKS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7911. A bill for the relief of Michael Breck; with amendment (Rept. No. 1970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 13035) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 13036) to amend the national prohibition act so as to prevent padlocking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 13037) authorizing the appropriation of the sum of \$7,200,000 out of the Federal Treasury for the building of a reservoir, to be known as the Angeles Reservoir, for the purpose of impounding not less than 280,000 acre-feet of water at the Angeles Dam site, which has been found feasible and recommended to hold this amount of water, on the Pecos River, in Texas, within the vicinity of the boundary line between Texas and New Mexico; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. FREAR: A bill (H. R. 13038) to provide an income tax law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13039) to provide an inheritance tax law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHAELSON: Resolution (H. Res. 259) for the consideration of a joint resolution to amend the eighteenth amend-

ment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Resolution (H. Res. 260) directing the return to the Treasury Department records, which were adduced as evidence before the select committee appointed under House Resolution No. 231, Sixty-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAVILA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 376) to change the name of the island of Porto Rico to "Puerto Rico"; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 377) to amend paragraph 1510 of the tariff act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDRESEN: A bill (H. R. 13040) for the relief of Adam Weinacht; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13041) for the relief of W. F. Zimmermann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 13042) granting a pension to Mathias Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 13043) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Hager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13044) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNERY: A bill (H. R. 13045) for the relief of Ada E. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 13046) for the relief of Orvil L. Larson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 13047) for the relief of Marvin Yeargin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13048) granting a pension to Rose M. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13049) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude Renkemeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 13050) granting an increase of pension to Isola Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 13051) for the relief of Grina Bros.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7591. Petition of the Roman and Greek Catholic Hungarian Federation of America urging Congress of the United States to use their good offices in inducing the countries and governments to cancel the treaty of Trianon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7592. By Mr. BLACKBURN: Petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Winchester, Ky., signed by Miss Ardelle McPherson, president, urging upon Congress the enactment into law of House bill 10960, relative to the citizenship and naturalization laws pertaining to married women; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

7593. Also, petition of the American Legion Auxiliary of Louisville, Ky., signed by Mrs. George C. Burton, pleading that Congress do not adjourn this session until after the enactment of the Johnson-Rankin bill to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7594. Also, petition of Harvey White, State commander of the American Legion of Kentucky, pleading that Congress do not adjourn this session until after favorable action has been taken on House bill 10381, to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7595. Also, petition of Miles J. Griffith, World War veteran of Dawson Springs, Ky., pleading that Congress do not adjourn this session until after it has enacted into law the Johnson bill to amend the World War veterans' act of 1924; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7596. By Mr. GARBNER of Oklahoma: Petition of Central Supply Association, Chicago, Ill., in support of House bill 11; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7597. Also, petition of the National Federation of Music Clubs, Port Huron, Mich., in support of Senate bill 1011; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7598. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Chicago Upholsterers' Union, 120 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the

passage of the half holiday bill, H. R. 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7599. Also, petition of W. W. De Wolf, president Chicago Typographical Union, 332 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 6603; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7600. Also, petition of G. S. Turner, president T-Z Railway Equipment Co., 14 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 9889; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7601. Also, petition of Gifford Dring, secretary-treasurer Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 8436 Vernon Avenue, Chicago, urging the adoption of the Couzens joint resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7602. Also, petition of A. J. Freide, secretary Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Knights of Pythias Hall, East St. Louis, Ill., requesting the adoption of the Couzens joint resolution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7603. By Mr. CULLEN: Resolution of the members of the New York Mercantile Exchange, opposing House bill 11096 so far as it relates to postage on first-class matter, and recommends a readjustment on second, third, and fourth class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

THURSDAY, June 19, 1930

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 18, 1930)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	George	La Follette	Shipstead
Ashurst	Gillett	McCulloch	Shortridge
Barkley	Glass	McKellar	Simmons
Bingham	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Black	Goldsborough	McNary	Steak
Blaine	Greene	Metcalf	Stelwer
Borah	Hale	Moses	Stephens
Bratton	Harris	Norris	Sullivan
Brock	Harrison	Oddie	Swanson
Broussard	Hastings	Overman	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Hatfield	Patterson	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Hayden	Phipps	Townsend
Connally	Hebert	Pine	Trammell
Copeland	Heflin	Pittman	Tydings
Couzens	Howell	Ransdell	Vandenberg
Cutting	Johnson	Reed	Wagner
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Deneen	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Kendrick	Robson, Ky.	Watson
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	Wheeler

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HAWES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to enable me to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CARAWAY. I yield.

RELIEF OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. McNARY. I submit the following unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the proposed agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that the unfinished business, House bill 11781, the rivers and harbors bill, be temporarily laid aside; that the Senate thereupon proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10381) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, and continue its consideration to the exclusion of all other business until the hour of 4 o'clock p. m. to-day; that at said hour the Senate pro-